

NYPL RESEARCH LIBRARIES



3 3433 06826919 4

ZKA
Height



THE GUIDE
TO THE
Understanding of the Holy Scriptures,
AND
The Unity of the Church.

THE LORD SAITH, I AND THE FATHER ARE ONE :
AND AGAIN OF THE FATHER, THE SON, AND THE
HOLY GHOST, IT IS WRITTEN, AND THESE THREE
ARE ONE; AND DOES ANY THINK THAT ONENESS
THUS PROCEEDINNG FROM THE DIVINE IMMUTABI-
LITY, AND COHERING IN HEAVENLY SACRAMENTS,
ADMITS OF BEING SUNDERED IN THE CHURCH,
AND SPILT BY THE DIVORCE OF ANTAGONIST
WILES? HE WHO HOLDS NOT THIS UNITY, HOLDS
NOT THE LAW OF GOD, HOLDS NOT THE FAITH OF
FATHER AND SON, HOLDS NOT THE TRUTH UNTO
SALVATION.

ST. CYPRIAN.

The Guide to the
Understanding of the Holy Scriptures,
And the Unity of the Church :

TWO SERMONS

PREACHED IN

ALL SAINTS' CHURCH, NEW YORK,

BY BENJAMIN I. HAIGHT, A. M.,

RECTOR.

WITH NOTES AND AN APPENDIX.

"QUOD SEMPER, QUOD UBIQUE, QUOD AB OMNIBUS."
Vincentius of Lirin.

"UNITY,—THAN WHICH NOTHING IS BETTER."
Ignatius.

NEW-YORK:
ALEXANDER V. BLAKE.

MDCCCXLI.



THAT WHICH IN THE TIME OF THE ANCIENT FATHERS, WAS ACCOUNTED TO BE 'TRULY AND PROPERLY CATHOLIC,' NAMELY 'THAT WHICH WAS BELIEVED EVERY WHERE, ALWAYS, AND BY ALL,' THAT IN THE SUCCEEDING AGES HATH EVERMORE BEEN PRESERVED, AND IS AT THIS DAY ENTIRELY PROFESSED IN OUR CHURCH.

ARCHBISHOP USHER.

LET PREACHERS, ABOVE ALL THINGS, BE CAREFUL THAT THEY NEVER TEACH AUGHT IN A SERMON TO BE RELIGIOUSLY HELD AND BELIEVED BY THE PEOPLE, EXCEPT THAT WHICH IS AGREEABLE TO THE DOCTRINE OF THE OLD OR NEW TESTAMENT; AND WHICH THE CATHOLIC FATHERS AND ANCIENT BISHOPS, HAVE COLLECTED FROM THAT VERY DOCTRINE.

CANON OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, A.D. 1751.

TO THE RIGHT REVEREND
WILLIAM ROLLINSON WHITTINGHAM, D. D.,
BISHOP OF MARYLAND,
IN MEMORY OF
THE MANY YEARS WE HAVE TAKEN SWEET COUNSEL
TOGETHER,
THESE SERMONS
ARE MOST AFFECTIONATELY
INSCRIBED.

NEW YORK, FEAST OF THE ANNUNCIATION, MDCCCXLI.

IT IS EVIDENT THAT EVERY DOCTRINE MUST BE
DEEMED TRUE WHICH CONSPIRES WITH THE APOS-
TOLICAL CHURCHES, WHICH ARE THE WOMBS AND
ORIGINALS WHENCE THE FAITH CAME OUT, AS
MAINTAINING THAT WITHOUT ANY QUESTION WHICH
THE CHURCHES RECEIVED FROM THE APOSTLES,
THE APOSTLES FROM CHRIST, AND CHRIST FROM
GOD: AND THAT ALL OTHER DOCTRINE IS UNDER
THE PREJUDICE OF BEING FALSE, WHICH IS CON-
TRARY TO THE TRUTH OF THE CHURCHES, OF THE
APOSTLES, OF CHRIST, AND OF GOD.

TERTULLIAN.

LETTER.

New York, January 15, 1841.

REV. AND DEAR SIR,

The undersigned, the Vestry of All Saints parish, address you this note with a view, respectfully, to solicit the publication of the Sermons which you have recently preached on the unity of the church, and the study of the Holy Scriptures.

In preferring this request, we are free to state that, whilst a compliance on your part will afford no small gratification to us personally, and will meet the wishes of many whom we represent, we seek the publication of these Sermons chiefly from a desire to prolong and to extend their usefulness. Containing as they do, a plain, logical, and faithful exposition of truths, always possessing great intrinsic value, but acquiring an especial importance from the present circumstances of the Church, we are anxious to have them in a form in which they may still further be employed, to produce a better understanding of subjects,

an intelligent acquaintance with which is essential to the spiritual well being, and, we may add, the social comfort and usefulness of all members of our communion. You are as fully aware, Sir, as we can be, of the extent to which erroneous impressions exist, respecting our views of the constitution of the Church, and of the relation which tradition holds to the inspired volume ; but we doubt if the clergy experience directly, the unpleasant consequences arising out of this unhappy state of things, to the same extent as do the laity. We are more immediately in contact with miscellaneous society, and misapprehensions, and prejudices, in regard to the Church, are more freely, and frequently expressed in our hearing. We find, therefore, that we have need to be prepared at all times, to give an answer to those who object to our peculiar views ; and upon the subject of which your sermons treat, we know of nothing which, from its spirit as well as its matter, could so well aid us in this duty ; and we confess that of the spirit we should be not less regardful than of the substance. Those who entertain misconceptions of our views are, in many cases, our friends, our relatives, or our neighbours, and being for the most part, we are happy to believe, honest in their prejudices, they are on every account entitled to our respect and love. We should be unwilling, therefore, to employ any document for the purpose of setting them right, but such as shall be perfectly charitable in its temper, at the same time that it is faithful to the Church ; and such a document we believe your sermons would afford us. They

speak the truth with frankness and with fullness, but at the same time in love. They insist upon the importance of church unity, but in accounting for its rupture there are no unkind reflections upon others, their object being to demonstrate, as they do most satisfactorily, that we have not occasioned or participated in it. They teach us to set a high value upon our apostolic institutions and forms, at the same time that they are calculated to secure the confidence of the pious and the good who differ from us, and to win from them at the least, a respectful consideration, by declaring, that the church is but a shell, and forms a mockery without that vital godliness which they were instituted to promote. They teach us to reverence the testimony of the early Fathers and of the Universal Church as to the sense of Scripture, but disdain most strenuously any view of tradition which conflicts in the slightest manner with the supremacy of Revelation. To quote the words of the venerable Bp. Jewel, they teach us that the Scriptures are “a very sure and infallible rule, whereby may be tried, whether the church do swerve or err, and whereunto all ecclesiastical doctrine ought to be called to account; and that against these Scriptures neither law, nor ordinance, nor any custom, ought to be heard—no, ‘though Paul himself or an angel from heaven’ should come and teach the contrary.”

These being our sincere impressions respecting the sermons, and of the further use which may be made of them for the benefit not only of our fellow

parishioners, but also of persons prejudiced against the Church, because, not knowing her real character and doctrines, we close by repeating our request for their publication.

Most respectfully and affectionately,

Yours,

JAMES BURGESS,
 ROBERT S. BARTOW,
 WM. STEBBINS,
 EVAN GRIFFITH,
 MOSES SMITH,
 JOHN B. HUNTER,
 ELISHA L. WALTON,
 THOS. S. UNDERHILL,
 JOHN H. WILLIAMS,
 PHILANDER HANFORD.

To the REV. BENJAMIN I. HAIGHT.

SERMON I.

THE GUIDE TO THE UNDERSTANDING OF THE
HOLY SCRIPTURES.

ACTS VIII: 30, 31.

UNDERSTANDEST THOU WHAT THOU READEST?

AND HE SAID HOW CAN I, EXCEPT SOME MAN
SHOULD GUIDE ME ?

THERE is one question of no little moment connected with the perusal of the Holy Scriptures, which may well engage our serious attention. That it is the privilege and duty of every man into whose hands this Sacred Volume is placed to read it diligently, and as he reads to pray for the help of the Holy Spirit to understand

it, is what all among us admit. But will this simple reading of the bare text of Holy Scripture with prayer, enable every man to arrive at a full knowledge of Divine Truth? Is the Bible without note or comment, a sufficient guide to the man who is sincerely seeking to know and to do the will of God, or does he stand in need of something else to preserve him from error, and to lead him into all truth?

Before answering the question, let us look back upon the history of Christianity for a few hundred years, and let us look around upon those who receive the Bible, as a Divine Revelation, in the present day. What, then, do we see as we turn and view past centuries? We see men with the Bible in their hands, which they have received as the Word of God, which they regard as the only source of Divine Truth, and which they have perused most assiduously upon bended knees, with hearts raised to heaven, differing not

a little in the interpretation which they give to many parts, and the views which they consequently hold in regard to points of no little importance. The same thing too, we see all around us at the present day. Christians are agreed upon the authenticity, genuineness, and inspiration of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments; they consent to regard them as the only standard of faith and practice, but they differ, and differ very widely, and upon very many points of interpretation, and some of them involving subjects of the highest moment. This is a matter of every day observation and remark. It is one of those facts about which there can be no dispute, however men may differ as to its importance. With one and the same Holy Volume there have been, and there are, upon a great variety of topics growing out of the same, almost as many minds as readers; and hence the vast multitude of sects and sub-divisions

of sects with which the land is filled. This is the fact in the case ; and this furnishes the answer to the query, whether the reading of the Scriptures with prayer is sufficient to lead a man to a full knowledge and understanding of the revealed will of God ? I say this furnishes the answer ; which it does, unless we will say that those who differ from us in their interpretations are not devout and pious students of the Bible, or that the points of difference between us do not affect the integrity of Divine Truth. In regard to this latter point, how can any one take the ground supposed, and yet, with the declarations of Christ and his Apostles as to the unity of the Church sounding in his ears, remain in a state of separation from those with whom he differs ? The very fact that he thus remains in a state of separation, proves that he does regard the difference between them as something more than a mere verbal one, and of no

importance. And in regard to the other point, but few will venture to call in question the piety of those who read the Holy Scriptures with different eyes from their own. Contending, as many around us do, with the Church of which we are members, and as to matters which we regard as most sacred and important, and our faith in which would not be resigned—no, not though the fire was kindled at the stake for those who held them as it was in days of Heathen and Roman persecution—we still regard our opponents as sincere and devout. ‘We believe that very many of them love Christ their master, truly, sincerely, and fervently, although we do not think their love according to knowledge. We do not speak harshly or bitterly, or say high and scornful things, but strive to show them, with all meekness, softness, and constancy, that our love for Christ is as strong and fresh, as jealous and vigorous as theirs; but that we express it in a

different way, because a more reverent way, more free from error, more full and satisfying, and spiritual, and as springing from obedience more acceptable in the sight of Him whom we adore and love.*'

We assume, then, the honesty and piety of the great mass of those who take the Bible as their standard of doctrine and rule of life; we take them to be sincere in their inquiries after truth; we must have cold and ungenerous hearts not to do so. What then is the conclusion to which we come? That in our search after a full, comprehensive and accurate view of Divine Truth, we need something else than the Scriptures studied with humility and prayer. Thus stu-

* See Rev. F. W. Faber's Tract, "The ancient things of the Catholic Church in England," p. 6, 7. This tract with several others of the same gifted author, have been reprinted by the Protestant Episcopal Tract Society. (Nos. 151, 153, 158, 159, 160.) They are indeed most beautiful most eloquent, most catholic, and breathe in every line the *charity* of the gospel.

dying them, I believe one doctrine to be therein revealed ; my neighbor, pursuing the same course, receives the opposite doctrine as true. I believe that Christ died for all men. He believes that he died only for a chosen few, and that the rest of mankind must inevitably be damned. I believe in the Holy Sacraments—their importance and their efficacy ; he attaches very little value to them, perhaps denies Holy Baptism to his children, or with very many, regards them both as carnal ordinances, having no binding force with Christians. I believe in Episcopacy. He regards this as Popery ; and the Romanist admitting it in name, almost denies it with his dogma of the supremacy of the Pope. This is the condition of things ; and this impels me to reply when asked, “ Understandest thou what thou readest ? ” “ HOW CAN I, EXCEPT SOME MAN SHOULD GUIDE ME ? ”

But who is to guide me ? Who is to

assure me which of the various interpretations of the Word of God is correct? Who is to inform me whether the Bible teaches the doctrines held by this body of Christians or by that?

Before replying to these questions, let us look back and see whether there was always this difficulty in the Christian World; whether the professed disciples of Christ always differed in this way as to the sense of our Blessed Saviour's words, and those of the Apostles. We need not look long. We can at once turn to a time when Christians, the world over, held the same doctrine. There was one faith, as there was one household—one family—one Church—one Saviour God. Hear what one says who lived in that blessed age, and who wears the crown of Martyrdom—Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons:—"This message and this faith, which the Church have received as I have said,

though disseminated through the whole world, she diligently guards as though she dwelt but in one place, and believes as uniformly as though she had but one soul and one heart, and preaches, teaches, hands down to posterity, as harmoniously as though she had but one mouth. True it is, the world's languages are various, but the power of the Tradition is one and the same. There is no difference of faith or tradition, whether in the Christians of Germany, or in Spain, or in Gaul, or in the East, or in Egypt, or in Africa, or in the more central parts of the world; but as the sun, God's creature, is one and the same in all the world, so also the preaching of the faith shines every where, and lighteth every one who will come to the knowledge of the Truth. Among the Rulers of the Church, neither he who is all powerful, in words speaks other doctrine, (for none can be above his Master,) nor does the weak in word, diminish the Tradi-

tion. For whereas the Faith is one and the same, neither he who has much to say concerning it hath any thing over, nor he who speaketh little, any lack.”*

Such is the eloquent description of the Christian Faith, as it existed in his time, given us by Irenæus, the disciple of St. John, Bishop and Martyr. Christians the world over, believed the same doctrines. And how came this universal agreement as to the sense of Holy Writ, and as to the doctrines of Christianity? It is not difficult to answer the question. The Apostles of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, having received their consecration to the high office of His representatives here below, and bearing His commission to “go and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things what-

* Irenæus *Adversus Hæreses*, Lib. I. Cap. III.

soever He had commanded," and carrying with them those memorable words of promise, so precious to them, and to those who have followed in their line—"Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world,"*—went forth and preached everywhere, the Lord working with them and confirming the word with signs following. Having received the promise of the Saviour—having been baptized with the Holy Ghost—they went forth and preached Jesus Christ and Him crucified, and summoned all to repentance and faith in Him; and to show that they were ambassadors of Christ—the true Messiah—they wrought many signs and wonders. They that gladly received the word were baptized, and so taken into the Church of Christ. Having thus entered into the fold, they continued in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship,

* Matt. 28 : 19, 20 .

and in breaking of bread and in prayers*. Over the congregations of baptized believers, thus gathered together, the Apostles placed elders whom they had ordained ; and that these with their several flocks, might not be without oversight, and that when the elders were removed by death or otherwise, their places might be properly filled, they ordained fit persons to discharge these and kindred duties, conveying to them the same grace and powers which they had received from Christ. So St. Paul writes to Titus, his own son, (as he styles him) after the common faith: "For this left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldst set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city, as I had appointed thee."† So also does he direct Timothy, at Ephesus, "not to receive an accusation against an elder,

* Acts 2 : 41, 42.

† Titus 1 : 5.

but before two or three witnesses, and to lay hands suddenly on no man.”* The Church of Christ was thus planted and fully organized, and provision made for perpetuating its distinguishing and fundamental features. The Apostles, taught by the Spirit of Christ, gave forth to the people the blessed truths, which they that believed were saved. They kept back nothing that was profitable to them, but showed them, and taught them publicly, and from house to house, declaring the whole counsel of God. What they had thus received from Christ, by His Holy Spirit, they in an especial manner, gave to those whom they ordained as their coadjutors and successors, with instructions to convey it to those who should come after them in the same sacred succession. “And the things that thou hast heard of me,” writes St. Paul

* 1 Tim. 5: 19, 22.

to Timothy, "among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also."* Thus taught by those who had been from the beginning eye-witnesses, and ministers of the Word, and who had been eye witnesses of His majesty, whom the Holy Ghost had taught all things, and to whose remembrance he had brought all things, whatsoever Christ had said unto them—the first Bishops, Priests, and Deacons preached the same glorious truths. To impress what they had taught by word of mouth more deeply on the hearts of their hearers, the Apostles and Evangelists wrote the Gospels and the several Epistles which have been handed down to us.† In these latter they refer

* 2 Timothy 2: 2.

† "Prior sermo quam liber, prior sensus quam stylus," saith Tertullian, the Apostles preacht before they writ, planted churches *before* they addrest Epistles to them. Dr. Hammond; see Appendix to Vincentius of Lirin's Com-monitory, (Oxford 1837,) p. 117.

to their previous oral teaching, remind them of the truths which they had heard and of the faith which they had professed, and exhort them to continue steadfast in the same. "Therefore, Brethren," writes St. Paul, to the Thessalonians, "stand fast and hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word or by our epistle."* As to the meaning then

* 2 Thess. 2: 15. "Consider for a moment how the faith was once delivered to the saints. Which of the gospels have been written on the day of Pentecost? Not one for twenty years.* And yet "the multitude of the believers continued steadfastly" from that time, "in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship" and were "of one mind and one mouth." Before a Gospel had been written, the faith had been delivered to the Saints, not only at Jerusalem, but in Antioch, in Ephesus, in Corinth, in Philippi, and even at Rome. * * * * * Thus before a word of the New Scriptures had been written, the faith of Christ had been delivered to the Saints, and preached throughout the world."

Bishop Doane: "the Faith once delivered to the Saints," p. 15, 16.

* The date of the earliest Gospel in Greek is fixed by Dr. Burton at 54; by Mr. Greswell at 55; by Mr. Horne at 61.

of the Epistles which were addressed to them, or of the Gospels, there could be no doubt or dispute. They did not bring up to the minds of the early Christians any new subjects or doctrines, but referred to points upon which they had been previously instructed by the Apostles, or by apostolic men ; and points, too, which had been summed up in the Creed which they had been taught, and which they often repeated, and which had been incorporated in the Liturgy which they constantly used. All question then, as to whether the Bible taught this doctrine, or that doctrine, was shut out of the early Church. What apostolic doctrine was, was well known, and Scripture doctrine could be in no wise different from it ; for the source of both was the same, and both were promulgated for the same end.*

No wonder, then, that, as Irenæus says,

* Note A.

‘ there was no difference of Faith or Tradition, whether in the Churches of Germany, or in Spain, or in Gaul, or in the East, or in Egypt, or in Africa, or in the more central parts of the world.’ And no wonder, too, that the three hundred and eighteen Bishops, assembled in council at Nice, nearly three hundred years after our Lord’s ascension, from all parts of the world were perfectly agreed* in their testimony as to what the Faith of the Church then was, as it had been from the beginning.† I say no wonder that it should have

* Five only of the whole number of Bishops present in this council—and they were as Eusebius Pamphilus testifies “ the most distinguished ministers of God from every part of Europe, Asia, and Africa ”—refused to subscribe to the creed which was adopted ; and these were Arians. See Rev. Dr. Boyle’s Historical view of the Council of Nice.

† The object of this and the other general councils “ was not to deduce new doctrines from Scripture, but simply to ascertain the universal tradition as to disputed points. The Fathers of the Nicene Council were very careful to declare that the form of faith they promulgated was not an invention or deduction of their own, but the very same

been so. Indeed, it is impossible to see how it could have been otherwise. And so the faith of the Church would have continued one and the same down to the present time; and at this late date, would have been one and the same in America, and England, and Italy, and Greece, and Africa, and India, had men but adhered to the primitive doctrine and to primitive usages—had they, in the interpretation of Scripture, but kept close to Apostolic teaching, as witnessed to, by a long train of saints and martyrs, and as

which they had received when they were first instructed in the principles of religion. And the Novatian Bishop Acesius himself admitted to Constantine, that it was no new thing that was there decided on, but that the council had decided according to tradition. And this was probably the reason why, at the commencement of the session, when the logicians began to discuss and dispute, they were immediately put to silence—the Fathers came not to debate about the faith, but to bear testimony.”

Dr. Hook : Five sermons before the University of Oxford, p. 118.

embodied in the Creeds and formularies of the ancient Church. But this they did not do. Pride of intellect, evil passions, worldly influence—these and other causes operated to lead men to leave “the old paths, the good way,” and to mark out new ones; and so false doctrine, heresy, and schism, were brought into the Christian fold. The unity of the Church was rent. The one faith gave way to a thousand systems of man’s invention, and all the grievous evils were introduced under which Christendom now groans, as it has for at least nine centuries, by which the people of God are so sorely perplexed, and on account of which the enemy so loudly triumphs. How long, O Lord! How long, O Lord of Hosts! wilt thou not have mercy on Jerusalem, against which thou hast had indignation these many years! O, as we think of the evils which the departure from primitive truths and order has entailed upon the Church

of Christ,—of the strife, and distrust, and doubt, and difficulty of every sort which have thereby been engendered, and of the blight which it brought upon the hopes of the Church of God—of the check which it gave to Her onward career of glory—and of the strength which was thereby given to the kingdom of sin, satan, and death—with Israel of old, by the waters of Babylon, we may well sit down and weep as we remember Zion. Well may the Church say with the Prophet (and O whose heart does not go along with Her, as She thus pours out Her bitterness,) “For these things I weep, mine eye, mine eye runneth down with water, because the Comforter that should relieve my soul is far from me : my children are desolate, because the enemy prevailed.” Blessed hope, that thus it shall not always be ! “Thou, O Lord ! shalt endure forever ; and thy remembrance unto all generations. Thou shalt arise and have mercy

upon Zion: for the time to favour her, yea, the set time is come.”

From the foregoing statement—and be it remembered, it is a simple statement of historic fact—we derive an answer to the question proposed: Who is to guide us in our interpretation of the words of Holy Scripture? The answer is obvious: Primitive Antiquity. We are to interpret it, as it was interpreted by those to whom it was first delivered by inspired men, and who received it with their comments. We are to follow the teaching of the Church of Christ in Her days of first love, of virgin purity, and of burning zeal—the days when Her Bishops, and Priests, and Deacons, and Her Laity too, yea even delicate women and tender children, bore in their bodies the mark of the Lord Jesus, and sealed their faith with their blood. We are to follow this teaching as it is embodied in the primitive

Creeds and Liturgies, and as witnessed to by a long line of men pre-eminent for holiness and learning. We are to take the points of Sacred Truth which they agree in declaring to have been professed "from the beginning, every where, and by all," as points settled beyond dispute, and as furnishing the key by which the treasures of Scripture are to be unlocked. "To understand the Holy Scriptures aright," says the apostolic Bishop Wilson, whose praise is in all the Churches, "is to understand them AS THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH DID."*

But is there not a difficulty here? Am I not proposing a guide whom it is exceed-

* *Sacra Privata*, p. 84, the entire work reprinted at Oxford in 1838, and recently republished in this city by Messrs. Appleton. A work that will never die, and one which no Churchman should be without.

So also Bishop Stillingfleet : "where the sense appears doubtful, and disputes have been raised about it, inquire into the sense of the Christian Church in the first ages as the best interpreter of scripture." *Ecclesiastical cases*, p. 118.

ingly perplexing to find and to follow? Am I not rendering it almost an impossibility for plain men to arrive at a knowledge of the truth? Am I not making it obligatory on them to go into an extensive course of reading of the Ancient Fathers, and do I not set them adrift on a wide ocean of uncertainty? Very far from it. The faith of the primitive Church is not so difficult to be ascertained, as these and similar questions might lead one to suppose. It is not something vague, and uncertain, and undefined, and scattered hither and thither, and only to be found by a long and laborious search. It says not, "Who shall ascend into heaven? or who shall descend into the deep?" "But what saith it? The word is nigh thee." From the days of the Apostles down to the present hour has it been held up to view, and been witnessed to, by the Church of Christ, in Her creeds and formularies, and by the con-

cordant teaching of Her Bishops and Doctors. And to us, my brethren, is it presented in its fulness and purity in the Book of Common Prayer. Rightly has this venerable volume been styled a Commentary upon the holy Scriptures. Not that it gives interpretations of particular passages; this it does not do, at least to any very great extent. But it embodies and illustrates the faith once delivered to the saints. It gives us the sum and substance of Divine Truth; and it does this in the way the very best calculated to awaken our attention, to enlist our feelings, to enlighten our understandings, and to lead to right faith, and to a course of life corresponding therewith. The Book of Common Prayer is a series of services, not composed in later days, or by any one man, or by any particular class of men, or school of Theology. Its prayers, and hymns, its liturgies and thanksgivings, its creeds and anthems, are all of

high antiquity. They have glowed upon the lips of Apostles, and Saints, and Martyrs. They have gone up to heaven from the cave, from the arena where the wild beasts were let loose upon the Christian, and from the stake where the disciples of Him who was nailed to the cross, gave their bodies to the scorching and devouring flame. It is the product of the combined piety, and wisdom, and experience, of centuries, and was cast into its present mould in times which tried men's souls, and by a succession of kindred spirits with those by whom its several parts were first indicted, and who, like them, counted not their lives dear unto themselves, but gladly shed their heart's blood for the truth as it is in Jesus. Yes, it is to such men as St. Chrysostom, and St. Basil, in ancient times—not to mention Fathers of an earlier date because of the difficulty of naming those by whom particular portions of the Ancient Liturgies were com-

posed*—and to such men as Cranmer, and Latimer, and Ridley, and Parker, at the period of the English Reformation—that we owe, under God, our Book of Common Prayer, which is not only a Manual of Devotion above all praise, but is at the same time, to those who use it aright, a safe guide to the old paths of pure doctrine, and evangelical principle.†

I repeat it then, in the words of holy Bishop Wilson, “to understand the Holy Scriptures aright, is to understand them as the primitive Church did,”‡ and I add,

* “Every page of our Liturgy recalls some holy father to our recollection, at least every page that does not bear a higher impress,—that of an Apostle or even of their divine master.” Voice of the Church.

† Note B.

‡ “My conclusion is, that albeit I never esteemed any authority equal to the Scriptures, yet I do think the unanimous consent of the Fathers, and the universal practice of the primitive church to be the best and most authentical interpreters of God’s word.” King Charles 1st to Mr. Henderson.

that to know how the Primitive Church understood them, as to all great fundamental, leading verities, we have only to read, mark, learn, and inwardly digest the Book of Common Prayer ; for in taking this book as our guide to the right understanding of Scripture, we take for our guide “ the consentient voice of the universal primitive Church.”

My brethren, what cause have we then for the most devout gratitude to Almighty God, that in these days of division, and dispute, and angry controversy, we have a friend to whom we may always go for the resolving of our doubts, for the removal of our difficulties, and for the answering of our inquiries. ‘Not, my brethren, that we would supersede the Holy Scriptures, or add to them, but that when seeking as all persons must do, some assistance to guide them to the right under-

standing of Scripture on fundamental points, we refer to the doctrines directly or indirectly brought before you in the Prayer Book, the authority of which rests on its embodying the primitive system ; and when we find the doctrine taught by the Bible, and the doctrine taught by the primitive tradition, confluent,—flowing like the waters of our own Ohio and Mississippi after their junction in one stream, though with distinguishable currents,—we then feel sure that the meaning we attach to Scripture is the right meaning,—that we know what the Gospel is, what it is that God has revealed, and we listen not for one half moment to those who try, by the very fanaticism of criticism, to attach some new meaning to the different texts by which any doctrine is supported. The old Scriptures, understood in the old sense, lead us to the old doctrine which was delivered of old, and once

for all to the saints.”* My brethren, I say not one word derogatory to the supreme authority and inexpressible value of the inspired Scriptures, as you well know, and as my previous sermons on the subject abundantly testify. No ! above all the controversies and questions which are raised, (to quote the eloquent words of a living Divine) “The great truth of the majesty of Holy Scripture stands pre-eminent, like some bold cliff above the dark and restless waters; some tall mountain at whose feet rolling mists and clouds are gathered, but the light of heaven is on its brow.†” That light we see. Before it we fall down in lowliest reverence. Upon this point the Church is explicit‡; and upon this point I will yield to no man.

* Slightly altered and adapted from p. 23 of Dr. Hook’s admirable sermon—“the Gospel and the Gospel only the basis of Education.”

† Dr. Hawkins.

‡ “The unrivalled authority ascribed by the Church of England to the written word,” says Bishop Jebb in the Ap-

But our business to-day has been with the *interpretation* of Scripture—our resource amid *conflicting doctrines*. And what I have said cannot be better summed up than in the prayer of the good Bishop whose words I have before quoted; which prayer may well be ever in our hearts, and on our lips, when we have the Bible in our hands: “Grant, O Lord, that in reading thy Holy Word, I may never prefer my private sentiments before those of the Church in the purely ancient times of Christianity.”* None more

pendix to his sermons, “is a fact of such notoriety, as to supersede the necessity of express evidence. Her subordinate reverence for pious antiquity may be less obvious to the superficial observer: but it admits of no less irrefragable proof.” This proof the Bishop then proceeds to adduce from the Liturgy and Canons of the Church, and from the writings of her Bishops and other Divines. Other testimony of the same tenor may be found in Tract No. 78 of “Tracts for the Times:” Vol. 3. p. 420. American Edition.

* Sacra Privata: p. 93.

ready than those who offer such a prayer at all times, to say, ‘“Speak, Lord, for thy servant heareth.”’ Speak to my heart, that I may obey thy word. ‘“Teach me to do thy will, for thou art my God.”’

NOTES TO SERMON I.

NOTE A.

ORAL TEACHING PRIOR TO THE WRITTEN WORD.

1. IT is obvious, as has already been mentioned, that all the several books of the New Testament were addressed *to Christians*, and *presuppose an acquaintance with Christian Doctrine*.

The first verse of almost every Epistle states the fact. They were addressed, for example, “to all that were at Rome called to be saints, whose faith was spoken of throughout the world ;” “unto the Church of God which is at Corinth ;” “unto the Churches of Galatia ;” “to the saints which were at Ephesus—at Philippi—Colosse—unto the Church of the Thessalonians ;” by St. Paul, again, to Timothy, Titus, Philemon, his “own sons in the faith ;” by St. Peter to those who were “elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ ;” to those, again, who had “obtained like precious faith with him through the

righteousness of God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ ;” by St. John to the “ elect lady and her children,” or to “ the well-beloved Gaius whom he loved in the truth ;” by St. Jude to “ them that were sanctified by God the Father, and preserved in Jesus Christ, and called.”

Several of these Apostolical addresses at once imply, that the great foundations of Christian truth were, or were supposed to be, familiar to these Christian converts. And if in a very few cases the fact, that an Epistle was addressed to Christians does not appear on the face of the superscription, it is presently implied in the plainest terms : as by St. Paul calling upon the Hebrews as “ holy brethren, partakers of the heavenly calling, to consider the Apostle and High Priest of our profession, Jesus Christ ;” by St. James, “ My brethren, have not the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Lord of glory, with respect of persons ;” by St. John, “ if we walk in the light as He is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ His Son cleanseth us from all sin.*

So obvious indeed, and incontrovertible is the fact, that the *Epistles* were all addressed to Christians already instructed in the faith, that Mr. Locke, advertng to this fact, and assuming that *some* books of the New Testament must have been designed to *teach* mankind, in the strict sense of the word, the great first truths of Christianity, concluded that the *Four*

* Heb. iii. 1. James ii. 1. 1 John i. 7.

Gospels must have this design. And hence the serious error in which for a time he acquiesced. But, the Historical Books were, equally with the Epistles, addressed to Christians, for the most part, according to the well-known accounts usually received among us, who had previously enjoyed the benefit of the personal ministry of the several Evangelists. But, waiving external testimony, we find it expressly stated, that the Gospel of St. Luke was written to Theophilus, in order that he “might know the certainty of those things *wherein he had been instructed.*” Examine the other Gospels, and their object, although not thus declared in so many words, will be found to be of the same kind. Whilst the Acts are only a continuation of the Gospel of St. Luke, and addressed to the same person.

2. But, again, all the several books of the New Testament being thus addressed to Christians, and implying some previous instruction in the faith, *the Teachers also were at hand by whom it should be supplied.*

“Hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word, or our Epistle.” Here we plainly recognize two distinct sources of instruction, the *oral* and the *written* teaching of the Apostle;—not, of course, any instruction derived from “Tradition,” in the technical sense of that word; “traditions” in this place simply meaning the truths which St. Paul had delivered to the Thessalonians, and that very recent-

ly, their conversion having occurred only the year before ;—but the Thessalonians are distinctly referred to his *oral* as well as to his *written* instructions.

And what took place in Thessalonica, took place also at Rome, Corinth, Ephesus, Philippi, and in every other scene of the Apostle's labours. Every where he taught the Christian truths partly by word of mouth, partly by his Epistles. And the same method prevailed, we cannot doubt, in all the other Churches planted by other Apostles ; prevailed, in a word, throughout the Universal Church, of which these several congregations were so many branches.

For a time, indeed, perhaps for fifteen or twenty years after the first preaching of the Gospel, it does not appear that any instructions were communicated to Christians in writing, And after this period, twenty years and more elapsed before the various books of the New Covenant were all composed ; and a much longer space of time before they were all received by every branch of the Church. The Christian Church, in short, was planted and flourished antecedently to the very existence of the Christian Scriptures.

It is somewhat remarkable perhaps, that, with the single exception of the Revelation of St. John,* we have no record of any divine appointment, under

* Rev. i. 11.

which any one of the books of the New Testament was composed. But whilst under the direction of the Holy Spirit, silent and unobserved, the admirable structure was gradually revealed, no man at first perceiving the harmony of its parts, and the just proportions of the whole ; Evangelists and Apostles often appearing to have little further aim, than to meet occasional emergencies, compose dissensions, solve difficulties, obviate errors, or bring back their sacred instructions after their decease, to the remembrance of their disciples ;—very different, meanwhile, was the case openly employed, in providing for continual *oral* instruction in every Church. In every instance where the Gospel was planted, a *Society* was also established ; Teachers were appointed ; and, in addition to those strong natural and religious obligations, by which Christian parents and Christian masters, are required to teach the truths of salvation to their children and households, over and above all this, express provision was made from the very first, for the religious instruction of the whole community, by the selection and appointment of *Ministers of the Word*. What their various orders, and what their other functions, we need not at present inquire. It is evident, and it is written, that among the offices of the several orders of the Christian Ministry were these :—to “ give attendance to reading, exhortation, doctrine,” to “ preach the word,” to be “ apt to teach,” to “ labor in the word and doctrine,” to be “ ministers of the new covenant, ministers of the Gospel.”

• 1 Tim. iv. 13. v. 17. iii. 3. 2 Tim. ii. 24. iv. 2 Tit. i.

3. Yet again, it is equally evident, that express provision was also made for a *continual succession of Christian* ministers to preach the word in every Church and to all conditions of men. And this, it should be observed, not merely before the completion of the Christian Scriptures, but afterwards.

“The things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses,” writes the Apostle Paul to the first Bishop of the Ephesian Church, “the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also.* No one will suppose that similar injunctions were not equally addressed to all who held a similar station ; but this passage occurs in one of the latest of the Epistles, written after the completion of the whole volume of the New Testament, with the exception only of the Gospel of St. John, and his Epistles, the Epistle of St. Jude, and the Revelation—that is to say, for all the purposes of this argument, (since these are not the writings, certainly, to supply elementary instruction introductory to the rest) this continual succession of Christian ministers was appointed after the Christian Scriptures were complete.

To object that the office of the ministers is not exclusive, is to add strength to my conclusion. Doubtless the sacred obligation is binding upon all men, to

9. 2 Cor. iii. 6. Eph. iii. 7. Acts vi. 4, 10. viii. 5, 35, 40.

* 2 Tim. ii. 2. cf 1 Tim. i. ii. Tit. i.

spread the knowledge of religious truth according to their several relations and opportunities. The Author of nature, and of our being, prescribes the duty. It was a duty before the Law, and under the Law, and how much more under the Gospel?* Christianity not only adopts this general obligation, but heightens and extends it." But then, evidently, the more we acknowledge the duty and importance of private and domestic teaching, the more observable is the special appointment of the ministerial orders for public as well as private teaching and catechising. We find a great natural provision for religious instruction, growing out of the very constitution of our nature, and the methods by which Divine Providence has appointed that we shall be born, reared, educated, and distributed into the various relations of social and domestic life; we find Christianity adopting, and enforcing the obligation to teach what we have been taught, which flows from this providential arrangement; and yet, in addition to all this, we find our Lord and his Apostles setting apart and consecrating within the Church an express Institution for the Ministry of the word, and careful provision made for the continuation of this Institution to all succeeding times.—Striking intimations these of an original design and intention, that oral instruction, the teaching of men, uninspired men, should introduce or accompany the study of the written word.

Dr. Hawkins' Bampton Lectures p. 38—45.

* See Gen. xviii. 17—19. Deut. vii. 7, 20. Exod. xii. 26,

NOTE B.

THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER A COMMENTARY ON
THE SCRIPTURES.

BUT after all, it will probably be said, that the examination of those written words, by which we are to ascertain the true meaning of the Holy Scriptures, is a task which none but those who have great learning, and much leisure, can accomplish; in other words, that Catholic Tradition is a source of information, open only to a few learned and wealthy men, but shut to the great mass of professing Christians. In one sense, this is the case, and, at first sight, it may appear as if there were no remedy. But there is a remedy; and fortunately such a remedy, as any member of the Church may, without much trouble or exertion, make available to his advantage. It is this; at the time of the Reformation, the pious and learned men, who undertook and accomplished that great work, considered the revealed word of God, contained in the Old and New Testaments, as the great charter of our faith; and they declared that the Holy Scriptures contained all truth necessary to salvation. But in order to ascertain the true and full meaning of the sacred Record, these holy men carefully and patiently exam-

13, 14. Josh. iv. 6, 21. Rom. xiv. 19, 15, 2. Eph. iv. 29, 6, 4. 1 Thess. v. 11. Tit. ii. 10. 1 Cor. viii. 16. 1 Pet. iii. 1

ined every ancient record and document, which bore on the subject. Nor was this all; they embodied the fruits of their labours in the several Formularies and offices which make up the Book of Common Prayer. The Prayer Book was not an invention, nor even a composition, of the Reformers; nor was it written at random; nor was it the work of one or two individuals; but it was a compilation, carefully and faithfully gathered from the primitive Liturgies, and the writings of the early Christian Fathers, by those eminent and pious men, to whom we are indebted for the Reformation. In the Liturgy, the Creeds and Collects, the Offices for Baptism and the Holy Communion, the Catechism, and other Offices, the Ordinal and the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion, we have a full and complete commentary, shewing in the clearest and most distinct manner what the primitive Christians believed and taught, as the doctrine of Revelation. The Reformers further enable us to determine the system of divinity which the early Christians taught as deducible from the written record of God's word; for, from the ancient Liturgies, they so arranged the course of services for the year, that in them is delineated the great scheme of human redemption in all its essential features, whilst the true and catholic meaning of the Word of God, is so fixed in regard to every part of the mighty plan, that the faithful member of the Church can scarcely put a private or erroneous interpretation on any portion of the divine Record. Thus the member of the Church has, in his Prayer Book, all the information concern-

ing the meaning attached to God's holy word by the early Christians, that the Anglican Reformers, by profound learning and patient research, could discover. They examined the ancient Liturgies, Creeds, Decrees of Councils, and writings of individuals; he, therefore, who makes himself acquainted with the Liturgy, Creeds, Formularies, and Articles, contained in the Book of Common Prayer, is very well prepared to read the Bible, as it has always been understood and interpreted by those, who continued in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship. The learned are still expected to examine the original records of the primitive Church, and to ascertain the fulness of the evidence extant, for every doctrine deduced from Sacred Scriptures; but those who have neither time nor acquirements for such investigation, have only to lean on the whole host of Anglican Reformers—men who went to the stake in defence of the principles which they embodied in the Book of Common Prayer, and as witnesses of the true faith, which they had so fully proved. Safely, then, may every member of the Church trust to the evidence of such pious and learned men, and be content to throw in his lot with theirs. They faithfully proved all things; and they laid down their lives, rather than relinquish what was good. Thus the Church, as the pillar and ground of the truth, supplies a rule by which even the most unlearned of her members may be able to read and interpret the Bible, in all essential points, as it was read and interpreted by the immediate disciples of our Lord and His Apostles, and by the faithful in all ages. Nor does this

Catholic tradition of the true meaning of Scripture, give the least encouragement to the groundless notion, that Holy Scriptures contain only part of the revealed counsel of God, and that other essential truths have come down on the stream of oral, or unwritten Tradition, and may, at any fit time, be embodied into the Christian creed, by the chief rulers of the Church. Of this oral, or unwritten Tradition, something shall immediately be said. In the meantime, let it be remembered, that the written records, or Traditions of the Catholic Church, as they merely teach and preserve the true meaning of the Sacred Scriptures, can never be at variance with these, nor give rise to the necessity of new and strange interpretations of parts of the written word of God's will, in order to reconcile it with pretended unwritten traditions. The Book of Common Prayer, will not be found in any of its offices, Creeds, or Formularies, to jar in the least with the written record of the Divine counsel. It merely fixes the primitive interpretation which was given to all parts of the written word embodying essential doctrines. There is a species of Tradition, termed unwritten, or oral; but as there is no security of this being always agreeable to the word of God, but rather great reason to dread, that its tendency is to weaken, if not to set aside, the authority of the Sacred Record in its primitive and true meaning; the Protestant Episcopal Church, not only utterly rejects the authority of such vague tradition, but even refuses to recognize its existence.

Rev. J. B. Pratt: *Old Paths*, p. 166—171.

All the offices of the Prayer Book are ancient offices; for we are not to suppose that the Liturgy was the invention of a few Reformers three centuries ago. You may still find in the breviary and missal of the Roman Church the prayers and doctrines which we of the Church of England still use: our Reformers were maligned as papists for retaining them; all that they did was to reform the old Liturgies used in the Church of England, from those additions and abuses which had crept into them during the middle ages, through an endeavour, in each age, to adapt the ritual to the spirit of that age. The sin of the Roman Church is, that it has retained these novelties, in doctrine and practice, which, because they were novelties, were absconded by our Reformers, who retained in the Liturgy all that was ancient and Catholic, rejecting all that was new and peculiar. In doing this, our Reformers, intent not on pleasing the people, not on gaining popularity, not on consulting the spirit of the age, but on establishing and maintaining the truth as it is in Jesus, compared the ancient Liturgies of the Church of England, in the first instance, with Scripture, discarding at once what was plainly and palpably contrary thereto; such customs, for example, as praying in an unknown tongue, and seeking the intercession of dead saints: they then compared them with the ancient rituals, renouncing all usages not clearly primitive; and studying deeply the writings of the Fathers, they embodied the doctrines which had been universally received in the primitive Church in that which is the result and

glory of their labours, the Book of Common Prayer. And this it is which supplies us with an answer to those who, when we speak of primitive tradition, observe that this is all very well for the learned, but what are the unlearned to do? We point to the Prayer Book in reply, and say, in taking the Prayer Book for your guide to the right understanding of Scripture, the whole Prayer Book, catechism, articles, baptismal office, office for the Eucharist, office for the ordaining of bishops, priests, and deacons, you take for your guide the consentient voice of the universal primitive Church. I may add, that it is the privilege of the English Prayer Book to be the only work which even professes thus to preserve and embody the primitive tradition. For the Church of Rome, be it observed, does not profess even to defer to antiquity. We have already seen that the ultra-protestants do actually bend to tradition (though not the primitive tradition), while they reject the word. The papist, on the contrary, retains the word, perceiving its vast importance in argument, but rejects the thing, for by tradition in the Church of Rome is meant, not the ancient doctrines of the ancient Church, by which the Church of Rome is as much condemned as by the Bible, but whatever the particular Church of Rome has at any time, or may at this time decree.

Dr. Hook: The Gospel and the Gospel only, the basis of Education. p. 18—22.

Yes, my beloved brethren, deny it, or avoid it, or shrink from it, as he may, man needs a guide, even

with the Holy Scriptures in his hands, to lead him in the way in which he ought to go. And He who knows of what we all are made, and knows what we all need, in wisdom and in mercy has supplied it. When Paul commended the Bereans, because "they searched the scriptures," it was not on the ground that in their search alone, they found, or could maintain the truth. They heard his preaching, and that of his companion Silas, and "received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the Scriptures daily, whether those things were so." So now, "it is our birthright" as one has well expressed it, "to inherit the faith." We need not, each for himself, pass through the toilsome avenues of proof and evidence. The demonstration is wrought out for us by apostolic hands. We have their mind, who had the mind of Christ. The Church has been preserved to us, the keeper and the witness of the truth.* "It is her office to anticipate all reasonings, by holding forth the well approved results. And for this very cause it pleased God in the beginning, to store up in her, the whole treasure of the Gospel : her sacred books were as a steadfast remedy ever correcting her conceptions of heavenly things ; her living ministry, a thousand tongues ; her rule of faith, an universal instinct ; her councils, acts of deliberation ; her decrees, utterances of judgment. She was and is a living, responsible being ; witnessing, defining old truths, condemning false novelties. Her charge is to sustain

* So Article xx.

from age to age, the whole body of revealed wisdom ; to imbue each successive generation of her children, with the conclusions of the faith, openly tendering also the proofs of Holy Scripture ; and thus going before us from our childhood, being ever herself of one ripe age, teaching us what things are necessary, probable, or doubtful, both what we must and what we may believe, ever leading on those that still follow from conclusions to proofs, to inner ranges and to higher paths of wisdom.”*

Bp. Doane : Faith once delivered to the Saints, p. 19.

* Manning “ the Rule of Faith.”

SERMON II.

THE UNITY OF THE CHURCH.

1 CORINTHIANS 12: 12, 13.

FOR AS THE BODY IS ONE, AND HATH MANY MEMBERS, AND ALL THE MEMBERS OF THAT ONE BODY, BEING MANY, ARE ONE BODY : SO ALSO IS CHRIST. FOR BY ONE SPIRIT ARE WE ALL BAPTIZED INTO ONE BODY.

THE Apostle Saint Paul in the Chapter from which the text is taken, directs attention to several important duties incumbent on all the members of that Holy Society the Church of the Living God. Great prominence is given—and most justly—to the duty of the preservation of Christian Unity. “As the body is one,”

says he, "and hath many members, and all the members of that one body being many are one body : so also is Christ. For by one spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free ; and have been all made to drink into one spirit. For the Body is not one member but many." Now in these words he plainly teaches that the Christian Church is one ; that while it is made up of individuals, of different communities, and of different circumstances, it is yet one homogenous body, the several members whereof have important duties to perform one to the other, and are all bound to hold the faith in unity of spirit, and in the bond of peace. All have been baptized by one spirit into one body, and have been all made to drink into one spirit.

I remark then

I. That the violation of this unity is a sin.

The great and gracious God who established the Church, ordained unity as one of its distinguishing features. He made it one like his own glorious self. It was one in Paradise. It was one after the fall, under the Patriarchal dispensation, each family or household constituting a distinct branch of the Church, the head or priest of which was the father; each branch however bound to every other, and all bound together in one, by a common faith and a common Lord, even Jehovah himself. When from the deep corruption which spread over the earth, God saw fit to interpose that he might preserve the knowledge of himself and his will upon the earth, he chose one family as the object of his favours. Abraham and his seed were called as his servants and his friends; and to this *one* nation and this one body were given the light of his law and the blessing of his promises. This one nation—this one body, constituted the

ONE CHURCH OF GOD, to which pertained “the adoption and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises.”* Two families were not chosen, but one. The Church was not composed of various, disconnected, opposing tribes or sects, but was one concordant whole. And so it continued amid a great variety of circumstances,—in prosperity and in adversity, in peace and in war, at home and in captivity, in purity and in corruption, in light and in darkness,—down to the coming of the Messiah. And did He break this unity? Did He set up a rival Church? “Think not that I am come,” says He in the most explicit terms, “to destroy the Law or the Prophets: I am not come to destroy but to fulfil.”† No! the Church of the Redeemer—the New Dispensation was the complement, not the antagonist

* Rom. ix. 4.

† Matt. v. 17.

of that which preceded. It was the Church of God—THE SAME ONE CHURCH which had always existed,—in a state of manhood, whereas in its previous conditions it had been only in a state of infancy and childhood. The Jewish Dispensation—the Law—had done its work. The first covenant had decayed and waxen old, and was ready to vanish away. The days had come, foretold by Jeremiah the Prophet, when the Lord would make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah.* The Jewish Church then ceased to be, when Christ came, the High Priest of good things to come, and established his Church. That Church took up, as it were, the work of the Lord where the former had laid it down, and went on with it upon the same fundamental principles, though under widely different circumstances, and in a widely different

* Heb. viii. 8.

manner. As it had always been, so now the Church of God continued under the New Dispensation, *one*. That it might thus be one, and ever so remain, was the object of the Saviour's most earnest prayer before he left the world. "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word; that they all may be one as thou Father art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us: that the world may believe that thou hast sent me. And the glory which thou gavest me I have given them; that they may be one, even as we are one: I in them and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one; and that the world may know that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them as thou hast loved me."* Such was the prayer of the Son of God. It was his heart's desire that his followers every where, while time should last, should be

* Jno. xvii, 20, 24.

one,—one in Him. As He thus prayed He taught; and so we find after His ascension into Heaven, and the outpouring of the Holy Ghost, when by the preaching of His Apostles many were converted to the faith of Christ, they were baptized, and then “continued steadfastly in the Apostles’ fellowship, in breaking of bread, and in prayers.”* They were made members of the Church in the way of Christ’s appointment, by the reception of the Holy Sacrament of Baptism, and continued in union and communion with those whom Christ had left as his representatives, and as the rulers of His Church. And this fellowship with the Apostles and their successors in the high office of Chief Pastors of Christ’s flock, Christians are exhorted to maintain throughout the Epistles; and the truth that the Church is one, and that Christians should be one,

* Acts ii. 42.

is made prominent. Thus St. Paul enjoins the Ephesian Christians to endeavour to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace, and reminds them: "There is one body, and one spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and in you all."* And, not to multiply references,—in the passage whence the text is taken, you remember in what clear and full terms he speaks of these subjects. "For as the body is one and hath many members, and all the members of that one body being many are one body: so also is Christ. For by one spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one spirit."

The unity of the Church, then, is plain-

* E ph. iv. 4—8.

ly a matter of Divine appointment. The Church is a society, not of human institution, but of God's ordaining ; and it is His will, as is evident from its whole history from the days of man's primitive glory and happiness down to the times of the full establishment of the Christian Dispensation, and from the whole teaching of His word, that it should be one. How then is our position to be gainsayed that the violation of this unity is a sin ? Did God design and does He desire that His Church should be one ? Was it so originally when first established by His grace and power ? Did Christ pray for this unity, and did His Holy Apostles teach both by precept and example the importance of its preservation ? Then to break this unity is surely a sin. It is to go counter to the divine will. It is to transgress the law ; and as the Apostle teach-

es this is sin;* for "sin is the transgression of the law."† But

II. This unity has been violated.

This is a point which needs no lengthen-

* 1 Jno. iii. 4.

† Schism, or a violation of this unity, by separating from the Church, or causing parties in it, is declared in Scripture, and was held by the primitive christians, to be a great sin, and therefore inconsistent with a sincere christian profession. This sin may indeed be committed under circumstances rendering it more the misfortune than the fault of its subject, and therefore—there is the delightful persuasion—be recommended, for Christ's sake, to the forbearance and mercy of the great Judge. But still, it is a sin; for the word of God declares it such. And upon the just and allowed principles of both religious and moral law, whatever abets or encourages it, partakes of its sinful nature. The conscientious preservation, then, of christian unity will lead to that consistency of deportment which withholds all encouragement to departures, in ministry, sacraments, worship, doctrine, or discipline, from those which are connected with the unity of the Catholic Church, and of that branch of it to which, in the course of Providence, we may be united."

Bp. Onderdonk of N. Y. I have great pleasure in referring to the able matriculation sermon of my much respected and beloved Diocesan, upon this subject—the unity of the Church.

ed argument for its support. One glance at Christendom as it now is, and as it has been for centuries, will suffice. Instead of one body, we see a thousand. The seamless coat of the Redeemer is rent by strife and schisms. One says "I am of Paul, another, and I of Apollos, and another, I of Cephas." One calls the Pope his Master, another Luther, another Calvin, another Arminius, another—but there is almost no end to the multitude of sects with their leader. The unity of the Church of Christ was maintained for six hundred years. During this period, notwithstanding divisions which arose from time to time in different parts of the Catholic body, and which tended to diminish its glory, the Church formed but one spiritual fraternity, all Christians being members of the same body, and esteeming it their duty to hold communion with each other.* After the sixth or seventh cen-

* See Palmer's Ecclesiastical History, p. 67.

ture we look in vain for this universal agreement; and soon followed on the period of the Church's depression, degradation and defilement. At the era of the reformation, whatever may have been the benefits which resulted from that mighty movement, that of the restoration of primitive unity was not one. Nay, new divisions arose, and divisions upon divisions, until not only the name but the very idea of Christian unity was well nigh forgotten, and men began to think and to talk of the difference, and the schisms among Christians not only as venial and harmless, but actually as praiseworthy and beneficial.*

* The present state of Christians in this country is sometimes compared to that of the people of God, divided into tribes, and yet all marching onward to the promised Canaan. But it is forgotten that with this division into tribes (which be it remembered was rather civil than ecclesiastical) they were yet but one people—but one Church, with one priesthood, one creed, one system of religious rites. If there is any analogy to be found, it is in the present division of the Christian Church into distinct dioc-

The sin then of violating the unity of the Church has been committed. But

III. This sin cannot be laid at the door of that branch of the Church of Christ with which we are connected.

It is to the Church of England that the Protestant Episcopal Church in these United States is indebted, under God, for her first foundation and a long continuance of nursing care and protection.*

ses, or into national branches,—all of which, however, are bound together in the one Catholic and Apostolic Church. It is also sometimes said that by the present divisions a wholesome emulation between the different bodies is generated, and that if they were to be abolished, a spirit of sluggishness and apathy would inevitably creep in upon the Church. Without saying any thing as to the impropriety of such a line of argument when God has plainly expressed his will, is it not evident that every conceivable benefit springing from the separation of Christians into different and opposing bands, is gained by the division above referred to, into dioceses or national Churches, while the manifold evils under which we are suffering would be avoided.

* Preface to the Book of Common Prayer.

How then stands the case with that Church as to the sin of schism at the period of the Reformation? Prior to that period, the church in our Mother country was one. In the exercise of the rights and privileges which belonged to her as an independent branch of the Catholic Church, at the period spoken of, she made certain changes in her doctrine and discipline; not introducing novelties, but putting aside novelties—matters unknown to the Church in her days of primitive purity,—and returning to the ancient standard of faith and practice—the standard which had been acknowledged by her Bishops and Priests before Rome had planted her foot on her soil, and succeeded in foisting upon her sons her erroneous and strange and novel doctrines and customs.*

* See a very elaborate Tract in the *British Magazine*, No. 48 (Dec. 1835) from which the following list of Romish Errors, with the dates at which they were authoritatively imposed as terms of Communion, is taken.

Image worship, A. D. 787. Transubstantiation 1215.

Her right so to do is indisputable. It is inherent in the very nature of the Church itself. If she has departed, it matters not in what way, nor under what auspices,—if she has departed from God's word and primitive usage, it is her privilege and her duty to return, without regard to the views and decrees of any man, or of any body of men. And this is what the Church of England did, and with the general consent and conformity of her clergy and laity.* And the Pope himself did not openly object for a length of time. Indeed for eleven years after the accession of Elizabeth those who favoured the see of Rome remained in connexion and in Communion with the Church. During this time there was, as before, but one

Supremacy of the Roman See, 1215. Communion in one kind, 1414. Indulgences 1563. Seven Sacraments, 1563.

I may also refer to Dr. Hook's Sermon: "Novelties of Romanism," and Mr. Newman's very able Lecture, "Romanism neglectful of antiquity:" the second in his volume on the Prophetical office of the Church.

* See Appendix.

Church. Rival priests, rival congregations, rival altars did not exist. Then the Papists withdrew. They went out from the Church, and in defiance of primitive usage, and violation of the ancient Canons, set up another Church. They thus became separatists and schismatics.* What the Papists are thus in England, they are also in this country, inasmuch as both countries formed but one nation until the time of the American revolution, and inasmuch also as here they introduced their Episcopacy several years after the consecration of the first Bishops of the American Church.†

* See the Canons of the Councils of Constantinople 1. Ephesus and Chalcedon, quoted in Note A.

† "The Romanists schismatics in the United States." This point is well stated by the Rev. Mr. Coleman in a note to his recent Edition of Faber's Difficulties of Romanism, p. 277. The first Roman Bishopric (Baltimore), was not erected by the Pope until 1789; whereas three Bishops had been previously consecrated for the American Church, viz. Bishop Seabury in 1784, and Bishops Provoost and White in 1787.

And as the Romanists thus went out of the Church and set up a sect of their own in England, so likewise at the same period, did the Puritans leave the Church and establish an opposing Communion. Having imbibed a taste for the doctrines of the Continental Reformers, the exiles under Mary, who had fled to Germany and Switzerland, on their return under Elizabeth endeavoured to mould the Church of England according to these models. But they were unable to accomplish this, inasmuch as the Church went on as she had begun under Edward VI. looking to primitive antiquity and the consent of the Catholic Fathers and the Ancient Bishops as her guide and pattern; and hence after much fruitless agitation to effect their object, they at length began to declaim

On the whole subject of the Independence of the Church of England and the schismatical character of the proceedings of the Church of Rome in regard to her,—See the Appendix.

against her as popish and superstitious, and affirming Episcopacy to be anti-christian, they separated from the Church and formed conventicles.*

Such are the facts of history in regard to the divisions which are found among Christians in England after the Reformation, and which have been unhappily perpetuated down to the present day, and have spread wherever the English language is spoken. They are facts which any one may soon ascertain for himself, and which cannot be denied. In thus stating them, I have no desire nor intention of criminating any one, much less of imputing to the descendants of those who thus originally broke Christian unity any wrong design or wicked intention. Just

* A. D. 1570 Vid. Palmer's Ecclesiastical History, p. 164. It is worthy of note how many of the grounds on which the Puritans justified their separation from the Church are given up by their descendants.

now it is with facts and facts alone that we are concerned, and with facts as demonstrating that the sin of violating the unity of the Church, resting where it may, is not upon the Anglican Church nor upon her Daughter in America.

IV. I remark in the fourth place, that this unity must be restored.

The days of the Church's oneness were the days of her glory and her strength. Then it was that the fruits of the spirit every where abounded.* Then were Christians known by the loftiness of their lives. Then were the soldiers of the cross successful in their warfare with the

* The Days of Old were days of might

In forms of greatness moulded,

And flowers of Heaven grew on the earth

Within the Church unfolded :

For grace fell fast as summer dew,

And saints to giant stature grew.

Rev. F. W. Faber, Poems, p. 48.

God of this world, and the Prince of the power of the air. Then was the cross carried forward with triumph. Like the ark of God in times of old, when it appeared Dagon fell on his face. The shrines of the false deities were deserted; their temples fell with decay; their priests were left without gifts and offerings.* Idolatry was laid low in the dust. Yes! these were the days when the commissioned servants of the cross went forth, a band of brothers, and in the spirit of their master, to plant His Church, administer His blessed sacraments and ordinances, and preach to all men the unsearchable riches of Christ. Forming one body, actuated by one spirit, having one end in view, contending with one enemy,

* Pliny, in his celebrated letter to Trajan, speaks of the great number of Christians of all ages and every rank and of both sexes—of the temples forsaken—of the sacred solemnities intermitted—and of the very few purchasers of the victims.

Lib. x : Ep. 97.

—the victory was theirs. How could it be otherwise? 'They were doing the work of the Lord, in the very way which He had appointed; and ere seventy years had elapsed, Christianity had spread throughout the Roman Empire, and in less than three hundred years was the general religion, and its blessed light had shined, and its power had been felt, throughout the then known world. But how is it now? Alas! when the golden chain was broken which bound the disciples of Christ in one holy brotherhood, the glory and the strength departed. Primitive piety, primitive zeal, primitive love, primitive self-denial, primitive labours, primitive missions, with their thousands of converts to the faith of the Gospel—where are they now to be found? We ask, but there comes no answer. Not that there is not very much that is lovely and of good report among Christians of the present day, or that there is not much zeal for and interest in

the spread of the Gospel. But we are looking at Christians the world over, and thus viewing them collectively, in the general results which they produce, in their relations to each other and to the world of infidelity, irreligion and paganism—how striking and how painful the contrast, between their apathy and failures—their distracted, feeble state—and the activity, and burning zeal, and united efforts and glorious triumphs of the Church when unity was her high privilege and distinguishing badge.* Never my Brethren, never will these days of pristine piety, and success in converting

* Talk not, my son, of early days :
 My precious stones were passing fair,
 My life was sacrament and prayer,
 My unity was praise.

These glories now are well nigh past :
 My son ! the world is waxing strong ;
 The day is hot ; the flight is long,
 And therefore do I fast.

Rev. F. W. Faber, *Poems*, p. 96.

the nations return, until that unity is restored. Never will Christians so love one another as did the early followers of Jesus, while they are separated from each other as they now are. Never will they so pray, and so run, and so strive, until one pulse beats in every heart. And never will the sceptic be silenced, and the heretic confounded, and the worldling changed, and the Mohammedan confuted, and the Idolater convinced of his folly and guilt, until they who name the name of Christ depart from iniquity, and laying aside their differences and jealousies and bickerings, agree in their representations of what Christianity really is, and stand up before the world as a band of brethren. What is the strong argument of the sinner and the Infidel for their folly? The disunion and the strife of Christians! What is the strong hold of all the opposing powers of the Gospel? The disunion and the strife of Christians!

We preach the truth as it is in Jesus to those among ourselves who neglect his Gospel and despise his Church, and they tauntingly reply,—what am I to believe amid all this variety of doctrine, and to which of your almost numberless bodies am I to belong? We go among the heathen. Christ and his Cross are preached. They listen. They are interested in the message. They inquire. They are disposed to enter the ark of safety, and lo! they find that the disciples of Jesus are not what their own sacred books declare they should be. They hear of rival sects and discordant doctrines, of animosities and strife, of hatred and variance—and they fall back.* Why does the work of the conversion of the Heathen advance so slowly? Because the strength of Christendom is frittered away by di-

* We should like your religion better, (said an Indian Brahmin and he doubtless spoke the general feeling) if there were not so many sorts of it.

vision, and because their intestine feuds are transferred—as they must of necessity be, while they exist—to distant shores along with those who repair thither to tell the benighted savage of his misery and danger, and of the way of relief and escape which has been provided by the Saviour? We are able at the best to do but little, and that little becomes almost nothing by reason of our want of unity. Our blessed Lord when he prayed that His followers in all ages might be one,—even as He was one with the Father—gave this as one of the reasons: “that the world may know that thou hast sent me.” And until His people are “made perfect in one,” the world will not believe His divine mission, nor acknowledge Him as their rightful Lord, and yield a ready obedience to all His commandments.*

* “Never yet has God’s work been done prosperously by divided hearts; never yet, except in the unity of the

V. How then, the question arises, can this most desirable end be accomplished? What can we do to restore the lost unity of the Church of God?

Without attempting a full answer to these questions, I mention two important steps which, in humble dependence on the promised assistance of the Holy Ghost, we are to take as members of a pure and apostolic branch of the Church, having the Word, the Ministry, and the Sacraments, and proffering to all around us communion on the terms on which such communion was held among the first Christians.

spirit, has the bond of peace been spread through the earth. But, then, my Lord, if this be the case, what is the practical inference which we should draw from it? There is one body which we, at least, this day, are satisfied is right, and that body is the Church. Let us act through that one body on this corrupting mass. Let the unity of Christ's Church redress the divisions of a disunited people; then shall God's work be done by us, even to the ends of the earth; and it shall return in blessings upon our head." Speech of Arch deacon Wilberforce.

1. The *truth* on this vital topic of Unity is to be spoken with the utmost fullness and frankness,—yet in love.* There is to be no putting the subject one side, as if it were too delicate a point for discussion, and as likely to wound the feelings of our fellow Christians. The only question should be—Is the subject an important one? Does it stand connected with the vital interests of religion? Has our God and Saviour spoken to us with reference to it? Answering these questions in the affirmative, as they must be answered, it is plain, that ensue what immediate consequences may, our path is a plain one; and as to consequences,—the Christian has learnt to leave them, in all such cases, in the hands of Him, by Whose command and under Whose guidance he acts. Not that we fear any unpleasant consequences even at the first from the fullest and plainest enunciation of the

* Eph. iv. 15.

true principles on this point. Such enunciation may at times startle those to whom it comes for the first time ;—it may alarm them, and render them uneasy ; but when made in the spirit of true Christian charity, and in all solemnity as becomes a matter of so high moment, it will always command respect, if not love, although it may fail to produce conviction. We would have then the principles of the Catholic Church stated and urged with all possible plainness and fervency,—and yet in all humility and love ; and at the same time have every proper method used to extend the borders of the Church and add to her strength. Her Missionaries, well prepared for their work, should go out on every side. Churches should be built wherein the Holy Sacraments may be truly administered and the word of God truly preached. Schools should be established wherein the young shall be regarded as immor-

tal beings and be fitted for their high destiny,—trained up for usefulness here, and for glory hereafter :—schools where the *heart*, equally with the head shall be regarded, and where, their duties towards God and his Church and their own souls shall not be suppressed lest offence should be given. The Press should be freely used, that so our Clergy may always be well supplied with the Word of God, and the Book of Common Prayer, and Tracts illustrating and enforcing their sublime and important truths, and that larger works speaking out the same great principles, and bringing forth the proof thereof may be widely circulated. In this way,—by boldly advancing the claims of the Catholic Church of Christ as contradistinguished from all who have left her communion, or who keep aloof from her pale, and by carrying her blessed doctrines and rites, with all her glorious

privileges every where as we have opportunity and ability, always demeaning ourselves lowly and as in earnest, looking neither to the right hand nor to the left, ever ready for conciliation but never for compromise,—in this way we may do much, by God's blessing, towards bringing back the golden age of the Church,—when they that believed “were of one heart and of one soul.”*

2. But I must pass on to the other step which I would specify as of prime im-

* Seize the banner, spread its fold !

Seize it with no faltering hold !

Spread its foldings high and fair,

Let all see the Cross is there !

What if to the trumpet's sound,

Voices few come answering round ?

Scarce a votary swells the burst

When the anthem peals at first ?

God hath sown and he will reap ;

Growth is slow when roots are deep.

Keble in *Lyra Apostolica*.

portance to be taken if we would do our duty in this weighty matter. It is this : that we always manifest in our temper, in our words, and in our deeds, the true spirit of the gospel ; that we always bear written on our front in living characters, such as men cannot help seeing—" Holiness to the Lord." Without piety,—deep, ardent piety—on the part of those whose privilege it is to belong to a pure branch of the Catholic Church, and who rightly appreciate such privilege and glory in it, in vain will they bring forward and urge the claims of that church, and endeavor to bring men into its fold and communion. We may talk and argue and preach about primitive doctrine and primitive customs, but without primitive holiness and primitive zeal, we shall talk and argue and preach but to little purpose. When churchmen, one and all, shall bring forth abundantly the fruits of the Spirit,—when they, as a body, shall

be known by their deadness to the world, and by their deep and lively interest in every thing pertaining to man's spiritual and eternal interests,—when the cross of their Lord traced on their brow at “the laver of regeneration” shall be deeply embedded in their hearts, and they shall evidently glory in it, and in it alone, and by it be crucified to the world,—then will those around them be disposed to receive with greater readiness their views of christian truth and of the Christian Church, and not to be so reluctant as they now are to adopt these as their own, and to regulate their practice accordingly. “As he which hath called you is holy, so be ye holy in all manner of conversation ; because it is written, Be ye holy ; for I am holy.”* “Herein,” says our blessed Lord, “is my Father glorified, that ye bear much fruit ; so shall ye be my disciples.” “By this shall

* 1 Pet. 1 : 15, 16.

all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another.”* Without holiness, without fruitfulness in all good works, without unfailing charity, how can we claim to be Christ’s disciples, or expect that men will recognize in us the followers of those who planted the church, and whose blood was its seed ? I cannot better close what I have to say upon this point, than in the words of an esteemed brother in the ministry. “ We may talk and preach and write for the Church, and men will talk and preach and write in reply. Let us act and live, let us watch and pray, let us fast and give, and our arguments will not so easily be repelled. Let us have the Apostolic spirit as well as the Apostolic succession ; and we may rest assured that a self-denying life, a spirit dead to the world and crucified with Christ, a faith working by love and overcoming the world, abun-

* John 15 : 8, 13 : 35.

dance of good works, watchings, fastings, and prayers—are the only developements of the apostolic succession that will have weight with men—and these *will* have weight. They will be a manifestation of the Church as the body of Christ. They will not be lifeless words, but an epistle, like the fruits of St. Paul's ministry in his Corinthian converts—"written in the heart to be read and known of all men."*

Thus then, by declaring the whole counsel of God, and by adorning the doctrine of God our Saviour in all things, we shall be labouring efficiently and successfully for the recovery of that unity among those who name the name of Christ, without which it must remain written upon the gates of the Church,—as it has now for so long a time been,

* "Voice of the Church and the 'Times,'" by Frater Catholicus. Churchman of February 29, 1840.

—"Ichabod: the glory is departed."* Pray then, my Brethren, "Thy kingdom come." Beseech "the Lord of the harvest that he will send forth labourers into the harvest." Cast your gifts into the treasury of the Lord. Remit no effort to extend the Church of Christ as she exists in our midst, in her primitive simplicity and integrity. And above all, "Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works and glorify your Father which is in heaven."

Blessed thought! that this unity of which we have been speaking will one day be consummated, not only here on earth as we believe it will—but that all the people of God of every age and clime, of all nations and kindreds and tongues and people, shall be gathered together in one vast company before the throne of God and the Lamb, and with them Angel,

* Note B.

and Archangel, Cherubim and Seraphim, forever to be animated with one desire, and forever to drink of the same fount of bliss. The Church above is now, as it ever has been, one. Such will it ever remain; and when the Church Militant is merged in the Church Triumphant, in the regeneration, when the Son of Man shall sit in the throne of his glory, then and to all eternity will it be PERFECT IN ONE, as Thou O Lord Christ art one with the Father! Then will strife, and division, and heresy, and error, and schism be unknown, and unknown forever:

“And perfect love and friendship reign
Throughout Eternity.”

EVEN SO COME, LORD JESUS!

NOTES TO SERMON II.

NOTE A.

ANCIENT CANONS AGAINST THE PAPISTS.

IN Canon VI. of the First Council of Constantinople A. D. 381, we read as follows :

“By heretics we mean both those who have formerly been declared so by the Church, and those who have since been anathematized by us ; and in addition to these, those who, while they pretend to confess to sound faith, *have separated themselves and made congregations contrary to our canonical bishops.*”

On this Canon, Mr. Perceval remarks, in his able and most valuable volume on the Roman schism—that the adherents to the Bishop of Rome in the British Dioceses “who have separated themselves, &c.” would stand condemned not only of schism

but of heresy, even if they had kept the Catholic faith pure and inviolate. How much more then when they have corrupted that faith with their new and unauthorized additions." p. 50.

So also was it decreed by the Council of Ephesus, A. D. 431. "That none of the Bishops beloved of God, take another province which has not been formerly and from the beginning subject to him. But, if any one has taken another, and by force has placed it under his control, he shall restore it ; that the canons of the Fathers be not transgressed, nor the pride of worldly power be introduced under the cloak of the priesthood, nor we by degrees come to lose that liberty wherewith our Lord Jesus Christ, the deliverer of all men, has endowed us by His own blood. It seemed good, therefore, to the holy and general synod that the proper rights of each province, which have before time from the beginning, by ancient custom, belonged to it, be preserved to it pure and inviolable."

On this decree Mr. Perceval remarks : " This is conclusive evidence against the Romish usurpations in Britain ; seeing that at the time this council was held, the Churches here were, as they had ever been, wholly independent of the Roman jurisdiction ; owning no superior under God but their own metropolitan. All the power that the Bishop of Rome afterwards, by slow degrees, acquired here, was in direct violation of this decree of the Catholic Church. It is in continued schismatical violation of the Catho-

lic rules that he continues to send Bishops into the British Isles." p. 51.

The Council of Chalcedon A. D. 451. likewise enacted a canon which teaches the same point.

"Let not a bishop go into another city or district not pertaining to him, to ordain any one, or to appoint any Presbyters or Deacons to places subject to another Bishop, unless with the consent of the proper Bishop of the district. If any one dare to do otherwise, let the ordination be invalid, and himself punished by the Synod."

On which Mr. Perceval remarks. "This is one of the numerous canons to be found in the ancient codes; by which the ministrations of the foreign bishops, in communion with Rome, in the English dioceses, are proved to be schismatical and invalid." p. 55.

* * * On the subject of this note, see Mr. Palmer's learned Vindication of the Episcopacy of the British Churches against Dr. Wiseman's objections. Sections 4—7.

NOTE B.

THE GLORY OF THE CHURCH IDENTIFIED WITH
HER UNITY.

Hence, as the Church of Christ is the kingdom of peace, so, wheresoever this mark of unity has been fully preserved, the Church has appeared in her beauty ; there she has put on her strength, there she has put on her beautiful garments : whereas, whensoever this unity has been disturbed, the portion of the Church with which the guilt rests, has become a byeword among the heathen, and a hissing and reproach among all nations. To keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace ; to submit with child-like humility, to be instructed in the faith, to be made acquainted with the ordinances, and to be trained up in the brotherly love and charity peculiar to the holy family of God, is the Christian's great duty. Nor will it do to say, that this unity is merely internal, and not also external. Internal unity of principle, must produce external agreement among the members of the Church, otherwise it is like faith without works. It may, however, be safely asserted, that in all ages of the Church, multitudes were to be found who were agreed in all the great principles of unity. They maintained the doctrines, revered the ordinances, and respected the Ministers of the Gospel ; and

in all these respects, they were as one in principle with those who went before: and so those who come after, to the end of time, will be as one with them, and with one another. Thus, in opinion there may be differences, even among the faithful; but in principle there will be the strictest unity. When I contemplate the result of unity, I see in it the reason of our blessed Lord's anxiety for the preservation of this distinguishing characteristic of His holy Church. He is the Prince of Peace; His Church is the Kingdom of Peace; and His design in establishing it on earth, is to prepare its members for the realms of Peace, in the presence of God. All the members of the Church triumphant, will be as one man in giving glory to God. The marks of this holy Church will there be seen glowing in noon day brightness; for all, with the humility and love of little children, will be as one in seeking to know and to do the will of God; in being made happy through the Divine grace, and in reverencing the authority of the great and eternal God into whose very presence they have been brought. There will be no "envying," nor "strife," nor "divisions," among the blessed inhabitants above. There will be nothing to disturb the peace of Christ's everlasting kingdom. All will be love and peace and unity. As a place of training for that glorious state, the Church on earth is intended; and would its members humbly and faithfully submit themselves to this gracious design, the Church militant would exhibit a correct likeness of the Church triumphant. Christians, whilst yet upon earth, would

begin to taste the happiness of heaven. The very spirit of God, which is the spirit of love and peace and unity, would reign triumphant; and the fruits would be apparent : all would be unity and peace and love. The members of this holy family would not only acknowledge one Lord, and profess one faith ; but they would also continue in one holy fellowship. They would be no more like children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine ; but would speak the truth in love, and grow up unto Him in all things, which is the Head, even Christ. Would to God that all who bear the Christian name, would seriously reflect on the heaven-like character, the angelic blessedness, of such a state of things ; and surely none among them would be found, who would not feel the love of Christ constraining them to promote and to maintain entire unity within the bosom of Christ's holy Church.

Rev. J. B. Pratt : "The Old Paths," p. 88—90.

The Scriptures then, it is henceforth to be assumed, hold out to our view the actual, historical Church as the great object of the love and regard of Christ, as the medium whereby was conferred that title under which His favour is conveyed to His individual members : and as intended to have unity in the body and the spirit, with universality, authority, visibility, permanency, sympathy : as the casket and treasure-house of God's immortal gifts : as destined to a present warfare, and a final glorification. Why have we lapsed from this magnificent conception of a

power incorporated upon earth, capable of resistance to all the enemies of Divine truth with the certainty of ultimate victory, this conception which comprehends alike all space and all time, concentrating to tenfold efficacy the power of every noble motive, and realizing and bringing home to our gross and feeble minds the sublime doctrine of supernatural grace? Why have we substituted for the idea, of which this is but a sketch, attesting by its very defects the losses we deplore, that misty, formless, lifeless, anomalous, negative, chaotic shape,

If shape it might be called that shape had none,
Distinguishable in member, joint, or limb :

which is the only counterpart, in many minds, to the name of the Scripture honoured Church? How far must we have departed from that condition in which Saint Augustine could write, *credamus, fratres, quantum quisque amat Ecclesiam Christi, tantum habet Spiritum Sanctum*.

Gladstone "Church Principles," &c. p. 116, a work, which coming as it does from a Layman,—a Member of the British Parliament—is destined, with the other masterly productions of his pen, powerfully to promote the cause of Truth.

THE CHURCH IS LIKEWISE ONE THOUGH SHE BE SPREAD ABROAD AND MULTIPLIES WITH THE INCREASE OF HER PROGENY: EVEN AS THE SUN HAS RAYS MANY, YET ONE LIGHT; AND THE TREES BOUGHS MANY, YET ITS STRENGTH IS ONE, SEATED IN THE DEEP LODGED ROOT; AND AS, WHEN MANY STREAMS FLOW DOWN FROM ONE SOURCE, THOUGH A MULTIPLICITY OF WATERS SEEMS TO BE DIFFUSED FROM THE OVERFLOWING ABUNDANCE, UNITY IS PRESERVED IN THE SOURCE ITSELF. PART A RAY OF THE SUN FROM ITS ORB, AND ITS UNITY FORBIDS THIS DIVISION OF LIGHT; BREAK A BRANCH FROM THE TREE, ONCE BROKEN IT CAN BUD NO MORE; CUT THE STREAM FROM ITS FOUNTAIN, THE REMNANT WILL BE DRIED UP. THUS THE CHURCH, FLOODED WITH THE LIGHT OF THE LORD, PUTS FORTH HER RAYS THROUGH THE WHOLE WORLD, WITH YET ONE LIGHT, WHICH IS SPREAD UPON ALL PLACES WHILE ITS UNITY OF BODY IS NOT INFRINGED. SHE STRETCHES FORTH HER BRANCHES OVER THE UNIVERSAL EARTH, IN THE RICHES OF PLENTY, AND POURS ABROAD HER BOUNTIFUL AND ONWARD STREAMS; YET THERE IS ONE HEAD; ONE SOURCE, ONE MOTHER ABUNDANT IN THE RESULTS OF HER FRUITFULNESS.

ST. CYPRIAN.

APPENDIX.

NOTHING SO GRIEVES THE SPIRIT
OF GOD AS THE CAUSING DIVI-
SIONS IN THE CHURCH; NOT EVEN
THE BLOOD OF MARTYRDOM CAN
ATONE FOR THIS CRIME.

ST. CHRYSOSTOM.

APPENDIX.

A BRIEF SKETCH OF THE HISTORY OF THE BRITISH CHURCH, SHEWING HER ANTIQUITY AND INDEPENDENCE, AND PROVING THAT SHE IS NOT SCHISMATICAL.

§ 1.

THE precise period of the first introduction of Christianity into the British Isles cannot be exactly ascertained. It is highly probable, however, that it was about the middle, or towards the end, of the first century. The foundation of the British Church has been indeed attributed to the apostles themselves, and there is no small ground for believing that the gospel was preached in Britain by St. Paul A. D. 50—61.* But whether this be so or not, it is certain

* See on this subject Chevallier's Translation of the Epistle of Clement, Note A. p. 38, American Edition, (Standard Works, P. E. Press, vol. IV.) I may also refer to my friend, Rev. W. H. Odenheimer's Treatise on the Origin and Compilation of the book of Common Prayer, Note A. p. 123.—a work to which I shall have occasion to refer again, and which I will say in passing is well worthy the careful perusal of every Churchman.

from the writings of the Ancient Fathers, Tertullian, Origen, Athanasius and others, that there were Christian Churches existing in Britain as early as the second century. The persecution which took place in the reign of Diocletian about A. D. 303, extended to this island, and St. Alban, the first British Martyr, was among the number who then perished.* But the impious purpose of the Roman Emperor was frustrated. Christianity survived all his fierce assaults, and was soon the acknowledged religion of the Empire. In the fourth century, such was the flourishing condition of the British Church, that we find three of her Bishops present and assisting in the Council of Arles A. D. 314. From this we conclude that her prelates were quite numerous, since it was customary to send but one or two out of a province that was best furnished.† At this council, it may be well to remark, the Bishop of Rome was not present; and when the decrees were sent to him, it was not that they might be confirmed by him, but that he might *publish* them throughout all his diocese. And in the letter of the prelates to him, in which they address him simply as “dear brother,” they express a wish that he had been there as they should have been glad of his vote and company. Nothing is said of his being the supreme head of the Church, or of his having authority to confirm or nullify the acts of the council. It would seem also that British Bishops were at the Council of Nice

* For an interesting account of St. Alban see that most delightful volume, Churton's Early English Church, p. 6.

† Collier's Ecclesiastical History, b. 1. p. 26.

in Asia A. D. 325. They were certainly at the councils of Sardicia A. D. 347, and of Ariminum, A. D. 359.

It is plain, then, that the British Church was founded, if not by one of the Apostles, at least within a very short period of the Apostolic times; that it was flourishing in the second, third, and fourth centuries; that in the latter her bishops were called upon to assist at different councils, and that they were wholly independent of the Bishop of Rome. Indeed they could not have been otherwise, as is evident from the writings of the early Fathers, which plainly teach that during the first four centuries all the Churches possessed an equal share of authority, and that *then* the Bishop of Rome did not pretend to the right of universal supremacy.*

During the period which elapsed between the death of Constantine in 337, and the removal of the Roman Legions in 448, the history of the British Church is rather obscure. The doctrines of Pelagius gained some converts, but they were soon banished by the labours of Germain and Lupus, two Bishops of France who visited Britain by request, to defend the

* Tertullian, in the second century, says that all the Apostolic Churches of his time were independent of each other and equal in rank and authority. In the third century, Cyprian maintains the perfect equality of Bishops. And in the fourth century, Jerome declares the Churches of Rome and Britain to be of "the same condition and merit and pastoral authority." See "Outline of the history of the British Church by Philecclesia," pp. 14, 15.

ancient orthodox faith. It was at this time that the country began to be very much troubled by the incursions of the Picts and Scots from the north, and by the descent of the Saxons from Germany. In the midst of their troubles, however, the British Christians sent a mission to the Picts, then inhabiting the southern parts of Scotland, and also to the Scots in Ireland. Soon, the Saxons became masters of the country, and then Christianity began to disappear from the most important provinces of Britain. They destroyed the Churches; and the priests fled before them, some to Brittany, others to Wales. Some of the British Bishops however still dwelt in the parts invaded as long as there was any means of assembling a flock of Christians around them. But it is an accusation to which they lie open that they made no attempt to convert the Saxons.* A few years afterwards the last British Bishops, Theonas of London, and Thadioc of York, retreated with the remnant of their flocks into Wales; and thus the Welch Clergy and St. Columba, with his fellow labourers at Iona, where he had a short time previously established his famous school of learning, were the only remaining teachers of the Church in Britain.†

* Churton's Early English Church, p. 20.

† In consequence of the great aversion of the Saxons to Christianity, the Church was obliged to conceal its conservation of the Episcopal Succession, which was notwithstanding carefully maintained in the persons of the Archbishops of London, the last of whom was Theonas mentioned above, and who was translated from the See of Gloucester.

Towards the close of the sixth century the attention of Gregory the Great, afterwards Bishop of Rome, was powerfully directed to the condition of the Pagan Saxons, by seeing some boys of unusual appearance offered for sale as slaves in the market place of the city, who, upon inquiry, he found came from Britain. Ascertaining that they were heathen, he determined himself to go on a mission to England, but was prevented by his friends, who would not suffer him to quit Rome. After his elevation to the see of that city, he very soon put his desire to benefit the Saxons into effect. He sent Augustine at the head of forty Missionaries, with directions to make his way into their country; and when discouraged by the reports which they received of it while detained in France, they were desirous of being recalled from the doubtful and dangerous enterprise, he animated them by his letters and expostulations to go forward, which they did, and landed in the isle of Thanet, in August, A. D. 596. At this time Ethelbert was King, whose wife Bertha, (the daughter of Clothaire I. King of the Franks,) was a Christian. On her marriage, she had brought with her a Christian Bishop, under whose care she continued to worship the true God, and to celebrate the rites of our holy faith in one of the old Churches of the Britons, which she caused to be repaired and dedicated to St. Martin of Tours.* Ethelbert received the Missionaries

* This Church, bearing the same name, is still standing, a little way out of the city of Canterbury,—the oldest of English Churches.

kindly, gave them a house in Canterbury, and allowed them the use of the Church just named. Soon after he himself believed and was baptized, as were also many of his people.

In the latter part of the year 597, Augustine, with the advice of Gregory, went to France to receive consecration to the Episcopate, at the hands of the Archbishop of Arles. On his return, he endeavoured to bring the British Clergy—the same who had fled from the Saxons into the fastnesses of the West of England—under subjection to his authority, and for this purpose assembled a council. He, however, failed in his attempt; for the British Bishops and Clergy at once and unanimously, rejected his demands, and repelled the idea of any foreign jurisdiction over their Church.* The reply of Dinoh, the learned Abbot of Bangor, which he made to Augustine is still preserved. Speaking in the name of all his brethren, he declares “that they owe the subjection of brotherly kindness and charity to the Church of God, and to the Pope of Rome, and to all Christians: but other obedience than that, they did not know to be due to him whom they called Pope; and for their parts they were under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Cærlleon upon Usk, who was under God, their spiritual overseer and director.”†

* Venerable Bede, *Eccl. Hist.* B. II. c. 2. p. 81. Giles' Ed.

† Spelman's *Concil. Brit.* I: 108. Collier's *Ecclesiastical History*, I: 76. Stillingfleet's *Origines Brittan*, Chap. 5: p. 361.

Augustine then convened a second synod, at a place afterwards called Augustine's Oak near the banks of the Severn, which was attended by seven British Bishops, and Dinoh the Abbot of Bangor. After conference he proposed that they should yield submission to certain decisions of the Romish Church with respect to the time of keeping Easter, and the mode of administering Baptism, declaring that unless they did so he would hold no fellowship with them. But the British Bishops refused to comply, considering this an unprecedented encroachment on their privileges, and believing that their liberties would thereby be endangered. Another thing also contributed to their refusal. Augustine was seated when they came into the council, and did not rise to receive them. This they took as a proof of pride, (especially as it had been pointed out to them while on their way to the assembly by a holy hermit, as an indication of an ungentle spirit, and so a proof that he was not sent of God,*) and said to each other, "If he treats us thus now, what may we expect if we submit to put ourselves under him as our primate?" Augustine was sorely disappointed at this issue, and left them, saying, "I foresee that if you will not have peace with brethren, you will have war with foes, and if you will not preach the way of life to the English, you will suffer deadly vengeance at their hands." These words were re-

* The story is given by Bede. B. II. c. 2 p 81

membered as having something prophetic in them, when a few years later twelve hundred Priests and Monks of the Monastery of Bangor were slaughtered by the army of Ethelfrid. Some have attributed this event to the enmity of Augustine who stirred up the Pagan Saxons against the British Christians ; but without foundation, as he was dead before the transaction, having lived but a short time after the conference just spoken of.

It is much to be regretted that Augustine pursued the course which he did in regard to the ancient British Church, as thereby the union of the Churches was prevented.* His was far from being a Catholic, Christian, line of conduct. His demands were unreasonable and unwarrantable, and the British Bishops were fully justifiable in rejecting them.†

From this period onward the Gospel was preached throughout England with varying success. Of the British Clergy many availed themselves of the openings which were made in different parts by the removal of prejudices against Christianity, and proclaimed the glad tidings of the Gospel to the benighted heathen. Among the most celebrated of these

* His successor Lawrence likewise sent letters to the Welch Bishops, and also to the Scottish, with the view of bringing them to an agreement with him.

† "The ancient British Church, by whomsoever planted, was a stranger to the Bishop of Rome and his pretended authority." Blackstone, Commentaries, B. 4, c. 8.

were Kentigern, St. Asaph, and St. Columba towards the close of the sixth century; and Finan, Aidan, Chad, Diuna, &c., through whose zealous efforts, united with those of other British prelates, or Irish Missionaries, the greatest part of Saxon England was converted. Indeed, as Mr. Soames observes, “only *two counties north of the Thames*, viz: Norfolk and Suffolk, can be said to have been subjected to Roman direction during the transition from Paganism to Christianity; and those two were largely indebted to domestic zeal for their conversion. Every other county from London to Edinburgh, has the full gratification of pointing to the ancient Church of Britain as its nursing mother in Christ’s holy faith.” The southern counties of England, however, (exclusive of Cornwall) were chiefly converted by the labours of the Romish Missionaries; and thus within a century after the arrival of Augustine, Christianity became the religion of all the Saxon States. Wales, Scotland, and Ireland, were already Christian, the Saxons never having overrun those countries.*

§ 2.

From this time onward there was but little intercourse between the two Churches. It is interesting however to note the events which brought them together from time to time, until the ancient Church of Britain was merged in that planted by Augustine under the auspices of the Bishop of Rome.†

* See Note at the end.

† Several of the facts brought forward in this section have been culled from Mr. Churton’s History before referred to.

Oswald, king of Northumbria, as soon as he was established on his throne, sent ambassadors to the Scottish princes, with whom he had before found refuge, praying them to send him a bishop, from whom the English people might receive the precepts of the faith which he had learnt among them. Accordingly, Aidan was sent, who received for his see the island of Lindisfarne; and with him many other Scottish monks and Priests. After a time disputes arose between the Clergy ordained by the Scots, and the disciples of Augustine and Paulinus, (who had come into the country afterwards with Eanfleda of Kent, whom Oswy, the brother and successor of Oswald, had married,) in regard to the old point,—the time of keeping Easter; and on this question a council was held at Whitby, A. D. 664, in which it was decided in favour of the Roman mode. In consequence of this, the Bishop of Lindisfarne, Colinan, shortly after resigned his bishopric and retired to Ireland, taking with him the greater part of his Scottish Clergy.

The first act of communion between the Welch and English Christians was at the consecration of Chad as Bishop of York, A. D. 660. Having been appointed to this see by Oswy king of Northumbria, he went for consecration to Wina, Bishop of Wessex, who performed the act, assisted by two Welch Bishops, probably from Cornwall and Somerset. When Theodore arrived some time after, as Archbishop of Canterbury, he doubted whether this con-

secration of the British Bishops was according to order, and proceeded to complete his consecration. The fact is worthy of note as being another instance of the *uncatholic* course pursued by the successors of Augustine towards the ancient Church of the land.*

About the year 700, a council of the Saxon Church was held, in which, Aldhelm, Abbot of Malmesbury, and Bishop of Sherborne, was appointed to write a letter to Gerent or Grant, the Welch king of Corn-

* " From its very origin the Anglican Church kept cautiously aloof from deriving from the British succession in the southern part of the island. Bishops were indeed received from Iona, and there was a considerable succession of them in the sees of Northumberland and Mercia ; but Rome, which from the first had such influence over the Anglican Church, was extremely jealous of alliance with Churches which maintained so sturdy an indifference towards her. She, therefore, at the very outset, forbade all spiritual commerce with the S. British Church, by enabling Augustine, contrary to the Canons in ordinary cases, to ordain suffragans without an assisting Bishop, because he was not likely to obtain such help from Gaul. (Beda, lib. 1. c. 27, § 64.) So rigidly was this acted upon, that when Theodore arrived, and found Chad in 'possession of York in virtue of a consecration at which two British Bishops had assisted he deposed him ;* and it so happened that he consecrated to every see, so as utterly to extinguish any derivation from Iona, and to introduce that of Rome only, Thus even the least infusion of descent from the original native Churches was expelled, and never afterwards received again."

Christian Remembrancer, Feb. 1841, p. 99.

* He did not depose him ; but after he had completed his consecration, Chad withdrew into retirement on account probably of a threatened division of parties in his diocese.

wall, to exhort him to adopt the Roman rule for Easter, and to conform to the other practices of the Saxon Christians. In his letter he complains, as he had reason to, of the treatment which the Saxons frequently received at the hands of the Welch, but seems to have laid too much stress on some trifling differences which he pressed the Welch clergy to adopt, particularly a mode of shaving the head, in imitation of our Saviour's crown of thorns, which they called St. Peter's tonsure. He seems also to have thought that there was something of necessity laid upon all Christians to follow the statutes of the Church founded by St. Peter. He acknowledges that the Welch Christians at this time held all the doctrines of the Catholic faith, but tells them their want of charity will destroy the benefit they would otherwise receive from it; "for a true faith and brotherly love" he says "always go hand in hand." This is true; but the Welch Church, as Mr. Churton well remarks, might justly have answered, "it is for you, Saxons, who came last into a country where there was an independent Christian Church, rather, by the rule of charity, to conform to us; but if not, at least not to require from us any thing more than the profession of that Catholic faith, which as it is sufficient for salvation, should be enough to secure to all fellow-Christians communion with each other."

At the close of the Saxon period the enmity between the two Churches had much softened. Ethelred the Saxon king had made a mutual alliance with

the Mountaineers against the Danes, which at least put a stop to their injuries committed on each other. The Welch Bishops after this came sometimes on friendly visits to their English brethren ; and in the case of Athelstan, Bishop of Hereford, who for the last thirteen years of his life was totally blind and unable to discharge any of his public duties, Tremorin, Bishop of St. Davids, regularly came for the whole period, to visit and confirm for him.

In the year 982, Dunstan, Archbishop of Canterbury, taking advantage of the successes of Edgar, subjected the see of Llandaff to Canterbury, consecrating Gogwgan its Bishop, with the assistance of four Anglican Bishops ; and the Anglican succession has remained there ever since.

Under Henry I, by whom Wales was reduced to a Province, the Church equally with the state was subjugated. In the year 1115, Bernard a Norman, was appointed Bishop of St. David's, by royal mandate, and was consecrated at Canterbury to which see he was compelled to profess subjection as to his metropolis. The other sees were similarly deprived of their old succession, which was thus lost. Bernard subsequently, but in vain, endeavoured to shake off subjection to the see of Canterbury and to resume the independent metropolitical powers of St. David's. Similar attempts were made after his death by the Canons of St. David but without success. And thus the British Church was at last absorbed into or

rather replaced by the Anglican,* and so was eventually brought under the Roman see, conformed to her ceremonies and discipline, and received her corruptions as they were successively introduced into the Catholic Church.

In regard to the supremacy of the Pope, however, it was not acknowledged in England until the reign of John, who in consequence of the interdict of Innocent III, and his sentence of excommunication against him, laid his crown at the legate's feet. For a long series of years previously, the Bishop of Rome had been striving to accomplish the subjugation of the Anglican Church and to reduce her to a state of vassalage. Even from the time of Augustine was this effort made; but it was steadily, and up to the thirteenth century successfully resisted.

In the year 747, at a synod held at Cliff's-hoe, near Rochester, Cuthbert, Archbishop of Canterbury, with the other English Bishops engaged to maintain their own laws against encroachment, keeping up a free correspondence with foreign Churches and a union of affection, but not flattering any person because he held a station of higher dignity in the Church. This was done upon the receipt of the Canons of a synod recently held at Augsburg, sent over by Winfrid, a Saxon by birth, at that time Missionary Bishop of the Germans Eastward of the Rhine,—giving more au-

* See Christian Remembrancer, Feb. 1841, p. 98, article, "Ancient British Church."

thority to the Bishop of Rome over the Churches in that part of the country than was allowed him in the English Church.

In 792, Alcuin of York,—(who under the patronage of the Emperor Charlemagne was the great restorer of learning on the continent of Europe, and who was at that time on a visit to England,)—and the Bishops of the English Church condemned the doctrine of the worship of images, declaring that “the Church of God holds it accursed.” Through the influence of Alcuin, Charlemagne was effectually engaged to use his influence to check this new doctrine; and in 794, he called together a council at Frankfort on the Main, in which three hundred Bishops solemnly condemned the doctrine, which had before received the sanction of the Greek Church and the Pope. And thus the progress of the error was for a long time afterwards prevented in Great Britain.

The first legate ever sent from Rome to England was during the reign of William the Conqueror; though William, when afterwards summoned by Gregory VII to do homage for his kingdom, refused, declaring that he held his kingdom of God only and his own sword, nor would he suffer any bills or letters from Rome to be produced without the sanction of his authority.

Up to the year 1125 the Pope had no jurisdiction in England, when William of Corboil, a French Priest, born near Paris, who had been raised to the See of

Canterbury, in order to fortify himself against the dislike of the Monks—he not being one of their number—procured a bull from Rome appointing him Pope's legate in ordinary, which was as much as to acknowledge that all the power or authority he was to exercise must come from the Pope's commission. He made the primacy of England consist in acting as the Pope's deputy. “Thus the independence of the English Church was lost by the folly of one French Priest: and it cost a struggle of full four hundred years, till in the Reformation its freedom was restored.”* though all along we find repeated protests on the part of the Monarchs and people of England against the usurped power of the pope.

From the foregoing brief recital of facts it is evident—that the Church of Christ existed in England several centuries before the arrival of Augustine from Rome—that the Anglo-Saxons themselves, for whom his mission was originally designed were converted *for the most part* by prelates of British origin—that notwithstanding all the efforts—so uncanonical and uncatholic,—of Augustine and his successors to subdue the independence of the British Church, she yet maintained for a long time her rightful and dignified position, yielding at last only because of the strong arm of the secular power—and finally that with the close communion maintained from the first between the Anglo-Saxon Church and the Roman See, there was yet no recognition of the supreme authority of the latter, and

* Churton.

no unqualified submission to its decrees for more than five Centuries.* This submission at last so reluctantly yielded, was, together with the corruptions in doctrine and practice which had been growing up for several hundred years, thrown off at the Reformation, when the Anglican Church arose in her might, reasserted her liberty, and returned to the principles and usages of her primitive martyrs and Bishops. Of this period we now proceed to treat:

§ 3.

The Reformation began in the reign of Henry VIII. The object which its principal promoters had in view was the restoration of the ancient order of things. They desired to place the Church, where she stood in the days of her purity, independence, and strength. REFORMATION not REVOLUTION—removing not rebuilding—cleansing not destroying—this was their aim. They asked for the *old* paths, where was the good way, and they walked therein. So they themselves plainly declare. “We,” says Bishop Jewell in his Apology of the Church of England, “the English Reformers, have approached as nearly as possibly we could to the Church of the apostles, and the *ancient catholic bishops and fathers*, which

* “Under the Anglo Saxon Dynasties the island was comparatively independent, and was more in *communion* with than *subjection* to, the Italian Pontiff; but the Norman line of monarchs, after William the Conqueror, submitted to the dictation of the Popes, and conceded one point after another, until the nation found itself completely under the foot of a foreign bishop.” Blackstone, “Commentaries” b. 4, c. 8.

we know was yet a perfect, and as Tertullian saith, an unspotted virgin, and not contaminated with any idolatry, or any great or public error. Neither have we only reformed our doctrine, *and made it like theirs*, but we have also brought the celebration of the sacraments, and the forms of our public rites and prayers, to an exact resemblance with their institutions or customs." So true is this, that the great majority of our formularies are translated from Latin and Greek rituals, which have been used for at least fourteen or fifteen hundred years in the Christian Church, while there is scarcely a portion of our Prayer Book which cannot in some way be traced to ancient offices.*

The Church of England then is not a *separated* branch from the Church of Rome.† Originally an *independent* Church, the *reassumption* of that independence which belonged to her from the very first, and the correction on *Scriptural principles* and by the *authorized members of her own body*, of those errors which *never did belong* to the primitive church, cannot be called a separation, but rather what it really was a *restoration*, as far as possible, to that pure and ancient model from which the Church of Rome *herself* had departed. And moreover "it is certain that during the reigns of Henry VIII and his successors, until the *eleventh* year of Queen Eliza-

* Palmer's Preface to *Origines Liturgicæ*.

† The remainder of this section is mostly taken from an Outline of the History of the British Church, &c., before quoted, a little work replete with interesting and important facts.

beth's reign, there were not two *separate* communions and worships in England. All the people were subject to the same pastors, attended the same churches, and received the same sacraments. It was only about 1570," (consequently many years after the rejection of the errors of popery) "that the Romish party, at the instigation of foreign emissaries, separated itself and fell from the Catholic Church of England." Sir Edward Coke, in the trial of Garnet the Jesuit in 1606, asserts that before the bull of Pius V. against Queen Elizabeth in the eleventh year of her reign, there were no recusants in England; "all came to Church (however popishly inclined or persuaded) in most points to the same divine service we now use." The same is also affirmed expressly in the Queen's instructions to Sir F. Walsingham, ambassador to France, dated August 11, 1570. Speaking of the leading Romanists, she says that "they did ordinarily resort, from the beginning of her reign, in all open places to the Churches, and to divine service in the Church without any contradiction or shew of misliking."* "It is evident then that the whole separation or schism was originated and effected by the Roman Pontiffs and their adherents, not by the churches in England. I repeat it as a fact which ought never to be forgotten, that we *did not go out from them*, but, as the Apostle says, they went out from us."†

* See British Magazine, No. xci. June, 1839, for a very full view of this point.

† See Palmer on the Church, 1: 455--458.

It is a great mistake, therefore, to speak of the Protestant Church of England as if it were a distinct body from that Church which subsisted in England until the reign of Henry VIII., or as if, at the Reformation, the Protestant clergy *supplanted* the clergy of the Church of Rome ; for it is certain, on the contrary that the bishops and clergy in England and Ireland remained the same as before, and that it was these, with the aid of the civil power, who delivered the Church of these kingdoms from the yoke of papal tyranny and usurpation, while, at the same time, they gradually removed from the minds of men those superstitious opinions and practices which at this period so greatly prevailed. In proof of this, when in 1534 the authority of the papal see was rejected by Henry VIII. and his parliament, this act was both sanctioned and concurred in by the bishops and clergy of England, who, having assembled in their respective convocations of Canterbury and York, signed a declaration that the pope or bishop of Rome had no more jurisdiction in this country by the word of God than any other foreign bishop.* “ It is notorious, also, that afterwards (in the reign of Elizabeth), when the Reformation was established, *all the parochial clergy with the exception of eighty, conformed.* The Bishops (having objected to take the oath of regal supremacy,) with one exception, then pursued a different course ; but, happily, an adequate supply was found in those bishops who had retired from the

* See Collier's Eccl. Hist. vol. ii. p. 94.

Marian persecution. And thus, with a very small exception indeed, the Church in the reign of Elizabeth consisted of the very same body of persons which formed it in the preceding reign. And the Reformation in England was not one set of individuals supplanting another, but was, what its name strictly expresses, the Reformation of that Church which had existed in this land without interruption from the earliest times.”*

The reply of Queen Elizabeth, when solicited by the Emperor and other Roman Catholic princes to deal favourably with the ejected bishops, and to allow the papists some Churches in cities and great towns, is well worthy of record. Her Majesty’s answer was as follows :—

“That although these bishops had refused compliance with that doctrine which, in the reigns of her father and brother, they had publicly recommended and maintained, yet notwithstanding this inconsistency and misbehaviour, she was willing to treat them gently. But to grant them churches to officiate in their worship, and keep up a distinct communion, were things which the public interest, her own honour and conscience, could not allow ; *neither was there any reason* for such an indulgence : for there was no *new faith* propagated in England ; *no religion set up, but that which was commanded by our Saviour, practised by the primitive Church, and unanimously ap-*

* See Strype’s Annals, i. 73.

proved by the Fathers of the best antiquity. Besides," she added, "to assign churches to different ceremonies and persuasions, is the direct way to puzzle good people, and make them unresolved; to encourage faction, to break religion into sects and parties, and embroil both Church and State."*

We have now shewn that there was neither a *new* faith nor a *new* ministry introduced at the period of the Reformation; and with respect to the rejection of the papal yoke, which, having been unjustly forced upon her, the Church of England had a right to shake off,—in thus acting, she only rejected that which was, *from the very beginning, not only an usurpation, but a direct violation of the rules of the Church*, as decreed by the third general Council of Ephesus, A. D. 431.†

The pope has violated this canon. For the British Churches having always been independent of the papal see up to the arrival of Augustine in 596, the Roman pontiff was clearly bound by this decree (passed in 431) to leave them in that state of independency, and not to attempt any encroachment on their liberties. And to this Pope Gregory was particularly obliged, because, at his first promotion to the see, he declared, in a letter to the patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, &c., that he received the *four* general Councils of Nice, Constantinople, *Ephesus*,

* Collier, vol. ii. b. vi. p. 436.

† See note A, Sermon II.

and Chalcedon, with the same submission and regard he did for the *four gospels*.*

“Since, therefore, it is beyond denial, that the Churches in these islands knew no subjection to Rome up to the close of the sixth century (as has been already stated,) it is certain that every exercise of jurisdiction which the bishop of Rome practised afterwards, for a time, in this kingdom, was *in violation of the decrees of the Catholic Church*, and that the Churches here were merely acting *in obedience to those decrees*, when, after having made trial of that cruel bondage, they were enabled to release themselves from it.”† “Nor was it (as we have already seen) till the period of the Norman Conquest, in the middle of the eleventh century, that Rome assumed any thing like an ascendancy over our Church; and then it was not without a long and arduous struggle, that she established it. So that the real fact of the case is this,—that out of *eighteen centuries*, during which the Church of England has existed, somewhat less than *four centuries and a half* were passed under the usurped dominion of the see of Rome,—so great is the absurdity and palpable ignorance of historical facts evinced by those who represent the Church of England as a separated branch from the Romish communion. For, in all essential

* Greg. Epist., l. i. ep. 24; and Collier's Eccles. Hist., b. ii. p. 76.

† See an excellent tract in the British Magazine, vol. viii. p. 642.

points,—in doctrine, in the sacraments, in the unbroken succession of ministers, the Church of England is at this day the same which it was in the primitive times.”*

Sufficient has now been said to prove both the antiquity and independence of the Church of England. For we have seen that it was founded, if not by the apostles themselves, at least within a century of the apostolic times; that it was flourishing in the second, third, and fourth centuries; and in the latter, was represented by British prelates at different Councils. That in those days there was no attempt on the part of the bishops of Rome to arrogate to themselves the right of universal supremacy, but that all the apostolic Churches of that period were independent of each other, and of equal rank and authority. That the British Church had existed as a distinct and independent Church for some years previous to the arrival of the Romish missionaries; and that however much England may be indebted to the latter for their zealous efforts in behalf of the pagan Saxons, by which means many embraced Christianity; yet that by far the greater proportion of the Saxons were converted by prelates of British origin. That the latter prelates refused to yield their independence, by submitting to the authority of the Church of Rome, their obedience to that see having

* See *Romanism and Dissent*, by the Rev. W. Dodsworth; *Discourse on the Duty of Members of the Church of England*, pp. 8-9.

never been demanded till the close of the sixth century; but that after a long resistance, the British, as well as the Saxons, conformed to her discipline, and received her corruptions as they were *successively* introduced into the Church. That it was not till about the middle of eleventh century that the pope acquired much spiritual power, or claimed any civil authority in these kingdoms; that one sovereign after another resisted and protested against the encroachments of the Romish see; but that at length, through the pusillanimous conduct of King John, the Church of England lost her independence in the thirteenth century, and with her independence, much of her remaining purity of doctrine. That even after this period, when the power of the Roman pontiff had reached its utmost extent in this country, the resistance manifested against papal encroachments by different monarchs who afterwards succeeded to the throne, plainly shews, that the English, however oppressed, never wholly lost sight of their independence either in Church or in State. That in the sixteenth century the *Reformation* of the Church of England took place, by which is to be understood, *not* the *separating* from any other Church, or the introduction of any *new* religion, but the casting off the corruption of the old, and its restoration to that pure and spiritual model of primitive antiquity, viz. “the holy Catholic and Apostolic Church.”

NOTE

THE CONVERSION OF ENGLAND NOT EFFECTED ALONE OR MAINLY
BY ROMISH MISSIONARIES.

In the year 596, the whole of Britain was divided among six nations or tribes: Britains, Scots, (or Irish,) Picts, Angles, Saxons and Jutes—the last three being German Colonies. The Britains received Christianity in Apostolic days; the Scots (or Irish) had received it by the middle of the fourth century. The Picts were converted to the faith of the Gospel by the Irish.

Of the German Colonies, who brought over the paganism of their ancestors,—the Angles, who peopled the large provinces of the east, middle, and north of England, were converted as follows. The East Angles, by Felix a Gallican Bishop, and Fursend an Irishman; the Middle Angles by Finan, an Irish Bishop; the North Angles, first indeed by Paulinus, a Roman Priest, who came over to assist Augustine, and who baptized king Edwin. But in a short time the people relapsing into heathenism, the Christian faith was again planted in an enduring manner by Aidan an Irish Bishop.

Of the Saxons,—the East Saxons first professed Christianity under Miletus made Bishop by Augustine; but relapsing into Paganism, as did the North Angles or Northumbrians they expelled Miletus from the country. They were afterwards converted by Cedd, consecrated Bishop by the Irish Finan. The West Saxons were converted by the Roman Missionary Birinus, thirty years after the death of Augustine. The South Saxons were converted in 681, nearly eighty years

after Augustine's death, by Wilifrid, a native of Britain, but attached to Rome.

And lastly the Jutes, who inhabited Kent, where Augustine first landed were not primarily indebted for the gospel to him, Lithardus a Christian Bishop from Gaul, having sowed the good seed before his arrival.

From this clear and comprehensive view of the whole subject, for which I am indebted to my friend and brother the Rev. W. H. Odenheimer,—“Offering to Churchmen.” Note C.p. 127; thus much at least appears, that when Augustine is styled the Apostle of England, and the conversion of the Heathen English is ascribed solely or mainly to his labours, and those of his successors, and to the continued efforts of the Bishops of Rome, much more is claimed than the facts in the case will justify.

See also Palmer's *Origines Liturgicæ*. Vol. II. p. 250.

THE NEW JERUSALEM.

"AND I saw the Holy City, New Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a Bride adorned for her husband."

The Holy Jerusalem
From highest heaven descending,
And crowned with a diadem
Of angel bands attending,
The Living City built on high,
Bright with celestial jewelry !

There with pearls the gates are dight,
Upon that Holy Mountain ;
And thither come both day and night,
Who in the Living Fountain
Have washed their robes from earthly stain,
And borne below Christ's lowly chain.

By the hand of the Unknown
The Living Stones are moulded
To a glorious shrine, ALL ONE,
Full soon to be unfolded ;
The building wherein God doth dwell,
The Holy Church Invisible.

Glory be to God, who laid
In heaven the foundation ;
And to the Spirit who hath made
The walls of our salvation ;
To Christ Himself the corner-stone,
Be glory ! to the Three in One.

LYRA APOSTOLICA ✓

ch

